

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
SPEAK OUT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is all too rare an occasion that permits young people to make their voices heard in Congress. For that reason, I am most proud to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a questionnaire drawn up by the students of the Second Congressional District High School Advisory Council and sent to the high school students of the Second District in Illinois.

Students in the Second Congressional District come from families of diverse and heterogeneous backgrounds. The district includes urban areas, suburbs, steel mills, universities, urban renewal areas, fine neighborhoods, slums—even some farms. The results of this poll, I believe, thus effectively show a representative cross section of the thinking of American youth about pressing national issues.

I hope that my colleagues will note the wide range of political and social concerns upon which the students have voiced articulate and genuine beliefs. The purpose and organization of the Student Advisory Council is made clearer, I think, by a short note from the student representatives on the council, and I am including that note as a preface to the complete tabulation below:

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN AND HOPE BY THE
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OF THE SECOND
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

As high school students growing and learning in a country increasingly faced with critical issues and decisions, we have found that the walls of our school can no longer hide the world. And yet, while we all have very deep feelings about the problems facing our community and our nation, because we neither vote nor riot, our views often go unnoticed.

Congressman Abner J. Mikva of our District recognized the problem and helped to develop the Second Congressional District High School Advisory Council. The Council, consisting of one representative from each high school in the District, meets several times a year with Congressman Mikva and discusses with him the problems we as students are facing and the solutions we feel would be helpful.

In order to better represent the students of our schools, and to establish a closer contact with our Representative in Congress, the council recently distributed a questionnaire to the high school students of the Second District. We feel the results of this questionnaire clearly show the deep concern young people have about the issues facing our country, and we hope this will be the start of a long and worthwhile dialog between the generations.

The complete results of the poll are summarized below:

SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL
ADVISORY COUNCIL
[Answers in percent]

1. Voting age: I favor lowering the voting age to 18:

Yes 81
No 12
Undecided 6
Did not reply 1

2. Marijuana:

I believe that the penalty for possession of marijuana is—

Too harsh 41
Appropriate 31
Not stiff enough 25
Did not reply 3

I think marijuana should be legalized:

Yes 31
No 51
Undecided 16
Did not reply 2

3. Hunger: It is my opinion that hunger is—

A very serious problem in Illinois 43
A somewhat serious problem in Illinois 43
Not a serious problem in Illinois 11
Did not reply 3

4. ROTC:

There is an ROTC program in my school:

Yes 30
No 65
Did not reply 5

There is no ROTC program in my school but I would like to see one established:

Yes 31
No 46
Did not reply 23

5. Draft law: I favor—

The previous system which permits student deferments 13
The present lottery system which permits student deferments 19
A lottery system with no student deferments 10
An all-volunteer army 54
Did not reply 4

6. Vietnam: I favor—

Reducing the level of fighting while peace negotiations are in progress 32
Continuing military operations at the present level regardless of developments in the Paris peace talks 9
Immediately withdrawing all our troops from Vietnam 39
Discontinuing negotiations and step up military operations to attain a military victory 15
Did not reply 5

7. College campuses: I believe the federal government should become involved in enforcing order on college campuses:

Yes 39
No 37
Undecided 21
Did not reply 3

8. Student councils:

(a) There is a student council in my school:

Yes 92
No 4
Did not reply 4

(b) I think the student council has a direct effect on school policies:

Yes 92
No 4
Did not reply 4

(c) I believe that my student government should have a say in school policy:

Yes 78
No 9
Undecided 9
Did not reply 4

Yes 31
No 50
Undecided 14
Did not reply 5

9. Dress code:

(a) There is a dress code in my school:

Yes 38
No 55
Did not reply 7

(b) I think the dress code is—

Too strict 23
Fair and proper 34
Not restrictive enough 7
Did not reply 36

10. School policy: I favor the community having a voice in the determination of school policy:

Yes 38
No 32
Undecided 21
Did not reply 9

11. Future government spending: I think the federal budget on future government spending should be as follows:

De-creased Same In-creased Did not reply

Defense budget 45 33 12 10
Aid to education 4 15 73 8
Poverty programs 8 17 67 8
Foreign aid 47 35 8 10
Aid to cities 10 37 45 8
Space program 50 30 13 7
Welfare program 16 27 49 8
Health 4 20 68 8

12. Availability of books, movies and magazines to the public: I think the laws regulating their availability should be—

Increased 16
Decreased 43
Remain the same 30
Did not reply 11

13. Guns: I believe that—

Everyone has a right to bear arms 17
Guns should be registered 50
All guns should be made illegal, except for law enforcement officers 21
Did not reply 12

14. Air pollution: It is my opinion that air pollution is—

A critical problem in this country 60
A serious problem in this country 27
Not a matter for serious concern in this country 3
Did not reply 10

15. City, state and local organizations: My feelings towards the following organizations are as follows:

Posi- tive Neg- a- tive Unde- cided Did not reply

American Civil Liberties Union 28 12 47 13
John Birch Society 7 41 38 14
Black Panther Party 22 50 16 12
City government in your area 33 31 23 13

	Positive	Negative	Undecided	Did not reply
Operation Breadbasket.....	54	19	15	12
Republican Party.....	20	33	35	12
Police.....	48	25	15	12
Democratic Party.....	39	16	32	13
U.S. Congress.....	41	17	29	13
New Mobilization Committee.....	21	17	47	15
American Independent Party.....	21	24	41	14
Students for a Democratic Society.....	26	40	21	13

WELCOME TO THE CHALLENGING WORLD OF BUSINESS

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, throughout my years of service in the Senate, I have always felt a close affinity with the business community. I am a product of it and remain convinced that American free enterprise has made an immeasurable contribution to the material and cultural welfare of America. Business is not without its problems but certainly most other segments of the American Nation also must make that admission.

Recently, Mr. Robert Marquardt, Thiokol Chemical Corp. group vice president, addressed the graduates of the School of Business and Economics at Weber State College in Ogden, Utah. Mr. Marquardt explained to the graduates what they could expect in the business world and pointed out to them that a certain amount of abuse by opponents and radicals would be part of their career experience. He also highlighted the great contributions of private industry and urged the graduates to continue in that tradition. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Marquardt's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Each time I stand before a group such as this an inner voice urges me to "make it short, make it real short." Over the years I have concluded that I am being told to "make it short" not from fear that you will go to sleep, but rather that you will not. Your energy, your preparedness, your motivation—and just plain moxie—warns me that I had better get back to work because one of you soon will come looking for my job. Right now, there are several things in favor of my keeping it. My age. My experience. And a most important ingredient that I call "street smart." Street smartness is nothing more than the product of my reactional biography and age with lessons learned in the real world as a catalyst.

One might assume that exposure to at least one graduation exercise per month would dull my enthusiasm for such events. Actually it works in reverse. Graduations have become the stimulant I need to climb the next rung, to accept the next challenge, to prove that the youth of today and the establishment are really one and the same, and—most importantly—to carry out my company's commitment to an "impossible dream." As an educator dealing with those not so fortunate as we, as an officer of one of our nation's largest companies, as a father,

and as a businessman, I feel compelled to level with you and to tell it to you like it is.

The American way of life is in serious trouble. Unrest in the ghettos and on the campuses, crime in the streets, undereducation, poor housing, decaying cities—all get the lion's share of the columns in your daily newspaper. As businessmen you are to become important in this country's solution to these problems! More, and more, business is being called upon for help.

"Business and industry built our cities," says Cleveland's energetic Negro Mayor Carl B. Stokes. "If they are going to be rebuilt, it will take more of that same investment and ingenuity. You can't develop a city without the private sector." As a local leader profoundly concerned about the deterioration of our social and physical environment, Stokes is the first to admit that such a plea for greater business involvement is a 180-degree reversal from local government thinking of a few years ago. In those days, says Stokes, business and government "eyed each other like strange tomcats." Today, he believes neither business, nor local government, nor society itself can afford not to have business involved in the problems that plague our urban environment.

Businessmen, of course, will never end vandalism or murder or man's basic inhumanity to man. But they are, for the first time, trying to help reduce some of the root causes of mounting urban unrest. They are also moving slowly—if somewhat tentatively—in the direction of what Dr. Charles E. Johnson of the Harvard Business School calls "synthetical decision making." This is a distinctly revolutionary process by which otherwise normal business decisions are governed partly by social, cultural, and environmental considerations.

Business leaders in our area have been very active in utilizing the resources of their companies to help solve the major social problems. Kennecott is actively leading statewide efforts in the JOBS program. Hercules is deeply involved in migrant laborer programs. Boise-Cascade is involved with the Department of Housing and Urban Development project Breakthrough in the development and production of low cost housing.

Here in Utah, Thiokol makes a major part of the propulsion systems for America's intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Poseidon and Minuteman missiles have been major deterrents in the U.S.-Russian cold war confrontation over the past ten years. Yet Thiokol also operates the Economic Development Operations, which is totally committed to the quest for solutions to social-ecological problems. Locally, we operate the Clearfield Job Corps Center and the Clearfield Advanced Corpsman Institute for Para-Professional Training. In New Mexico we have the Indian Law Enforcement Academy and the Indian Family Employment Training Center. We have similar schools in other states, and, in the last three years, have trained and placed more than 10,000 previously unemployed individuals. We work with HUD in some of its housing projects. We have built new plants in ghetto and rural poverty areas. We have developed specialized curricula for the unemployed and for public schools and colleges, including your own Weber State. We are assisting in training its public dropouts and potential dropouts and in its adult education programs. And we continue to develop specialized training programs for correctional institutions.

By thus applying our resources on Indian reservations, in large city slums, and in poverty areas wherever they are found, we feel we are fulfilling our company's social responsibilities. In so doing we have created new, diversified efforts for our company.

In this setting I welcome you to the challenging world of business, a bustling, changing enterprise. It will embrace you, anger

you, abet you, embarrass you, scold you, teach you and taunt you, and mature you—if you have what it takes. Let's look at some of the things you can expect in the business world during the decade of the 1970's.

One thing is certain—there will be change. Dramatic and traumatic change! Rapid change! No less an authority than John Everett, President of the New School for Social Reform, believes that the rate of change in the 70's will be at least twice as fast as the rate has been over the last 20 years. In other words, 1980 will be as different from 1970 as 1970 is from 1950. Viewed a little differently, in 1950 television had little more to offer than wrestling matches and Milton Berle. Newspapers and radio were the chief sources of news. In 1970 virtually every home has television. Who in 1950 would have predicted color television in millions of homes by 1970? Who in 1950 would have dared project that all the world would watch an American astronaut step onto the surface of the moon?

Ernest A. Jones, chairman of the board of MacManus, John and Adams, recently described the decade of the 1960's as one that began with John Kennedy challenging our determination, and ended with Tiny Tim challenging our digestion. I expect more than that from the 1970's. For the 1970's—as I see them—are bright with promise and opportunity. According to the National Planning Association, America won't have enough workers, skilled and unskilled, to do all it wants to do in this decade. This projection is made in the face of the population explosion and a high unemployment rate.

Today, the U.S. population totals about 204 million, and is expected to reach at least 235 million by 1980. An increase of 31 million in 10 years, equivalent to our entire population in 1860.

Economists predict that by 1980 more than one out of every three families in the U.S. will have an annual income of \$15,000 or more. By 1980 another 27.5 percent of our families will earn between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Therefore, slightly over 60 percent of all U.S. families in 1980 will earn in excess of \$10,000. Do you realize that as a nation the value of goods and services being produced per month—\$78 billion—is equal to our total annual output in 1939. Even this will grow by 50 percent by 1980.

As future business leaders you must understand that the coming of age of the new generation—your generation—will have significant impact on both the structure of our economy and the very way in which business will be conducted. Tomorrow's consumer will be younger—the number of household heads under 35 will grow twice as fast as the total adult population in the next 10 years. He will be much better schooled—over 40 percent of all young people in this decade will go on to college, compared to about half that rate in the '30's. That he will be appreciably better heeled has already been demonstrated. And beyond this, tomorrow's adult—judging from the message we are currently receiving from you, the young—will have different values and aspirations. Are you prepared to accept the challenge of such a business climate? I think you are.

Before you assume the mantle of leadership there is one more contract you must sign. If you are to be a businessman you must assume his hallmark, accept his vignette, embrace his reputation. Let me tell you now that soon you will be numbered among the most evil men in the United States. As a businessman, you will be called a polluter, a warmonger, a profiteer, an unscrupulous merchant. You will be held responsible for everything bad. You will be charged with causing overpopulation—an interesting allegation—and the technology of your employer will be called the ruination

of mankind. You will be told that medical and pharmaceutical discoveries, which have saved millions of babies from death and have held down wholesale pestilence and disease, are products of the establishment and that by extending life expectancy, they too are making the world overpopulated. Some will tell you that businessmen, through medical science, are permitting people to live too long.

Some of these allegations against the businessman are valid. He is a polluter. But so are you to some degree, as is virtually every other citizen of our country. So is the federal government. Business recognizes both its failure and its responsibility in the matter. So much so that in 1970 business will spend \$4 billion of its own dollars—not tax dollars—to solve the pollution problem. Hold your head up high my friends. Turn the other cheek. Tell it like it is. That \$4 billion is more money than NASA's space budget in the current year.

Technology, the product of industry, has been accused of dehumanizing us. Part of the contention is that technology has turned the modern employee into a machine, or— even worse—only part of a larger machine. Some of this may be a well deserved criticism, but most of it is pure poppycock. The part of our lives spent on the job is so much less burdensome today than it was 40 years ago it is simply ridiculous to speak of dehumanization. Does anyone really believe that the factory worker would rather carry a load on his back than drive that load around on a forklift? Does anyone believe that the engineer would rather scribble endless pages of calculations than submit those calculations to a computer? Does anyone believe the farmer would rather wrestle a plow pulled by a mule than ride down the row in the air conditioned cab of a tractor-cultivator?

Let me tell you some of the positive things I think a businessman is. In 1969, he found a quarter of a million "unemployables" who never could hold steady jobs. He trained them and put them into jobs that paid more money than they ever dreamed of earning before. For poor kids who couldn't otherwise go to college, he took \$350 million and saw to it that those who earned them got scholarships. Now isn't that evil? He gave an additional \$800 million to non-profit organizations for medical research, to help stamp out cancer, heart disease, and a hundred other dread diseases of the world. To build new housing for the poor and the middle income families in U.S. cities, he put up \$1.25 billion so that more people could live in decency. After that, he put up \$15 billion in social security taxes to help provide support and medical care for our senior citizens. This is the contribution of business above and beyond the social security payments of the employee. And he added \$41 billion in income taxes to help pay the bills of running our country. In addition to all these things, our country's most evil man contributed millions of hours of personal and business time to virtually every humanitarian cause. Remember these accusations, for you too soon will be called evil.

At the close of 1969, Time Magazine ran an advertisement that has provoked a remarkable response. The advertisement characterized people—all Americans, and, yes, even businessmen—rather than a product. It read like this:

"I have died in Vietnam. But I have walked the face of the moon.

I have befouled the waters and tainted the air of a magnificent land. But I have made it safe from disease.

I have flown through the sky faster than the sun. But I have idled in the streets made ugly with traffic.

I have littered the land with garbage. But I have built upon it a hundred million homes.

I have divided the schools with my prejudice. But I have sent armies to unite them.

I have beat down my enemies with clubs. But I have built courtrooms to keep them free.

I have built a bomb to destroy the world. But I have used it to light a light.

I have outraged my brothers in the alleys of the ghettos. But I have transplanted a human heart.

I have scribbled out filth and pornography. But I have elevated the philosophy of man.

I have watched children starve from my golden towers. But I have fed half of the earth.

I was raised in a grotesque slum. But I am surfed by the silver spoon of opulence.

I live in the greatest country in the world in the greatest time in history. But I scorn the ground I stand upon.

I am ashamed. But I am proud. I am an American."

My friends, I am proud of my profession, as you will be. Many of the dreams we shared with all Americans have failed to materialize entirely. Hunger and poverty have not disappeared from the earth. Pollution will not disappear for the asking. War in all its horror is still with us. I am willing to grant that deplorable conditions surround us. But those who condemn most loudly are not to be found rushing in with brooms and mops to help clean it up.

All over America, the young are shouting their concern about the plight of the poor. So is the most evil man in America, the businessman. So am I, a private citizen. Young, old, private citizen, college student, businessman—you and I share the same concern about the undernourished and undereducated wherever they live. Business is doing something about it. Will you accept the challenge to do more when you join our ranks.

May I leave you with this plea. Business desperately needs your personal leadership in helping to settle the deadly discrepancy between principle and procedure . . . of promise passed off as performance . . . of the wish presented as the deed. Perhaps with your help, industry will be able to cast off its image as the house of the most evil man in our nation. There is no one here today who is not deeply indebted to our society. We should ask ourselves: How many backs have been bent for us? How many hands extended in help? How many paths that we tread have been made by dead men's boots? Fortune has smiled upon us. Perhaps the time is now to pay our dues. Accept my challenge. Duplicate in the next ten years the progress that has been made in our country during the last 20 years. This is your world—the world of business.

"THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL PARADE"—AN ADDRESS BY RICHARD N. GARDNER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much concern in recent years about the state of the domestic environ-

ment in the United States. But the domestic dimension is only one aspect of a world ecological crisis.

Mr. Richard N. Gardner, formerly Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs and currently professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, has recently commented on the international aspects of the environmental crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Gardner's remarks in the RECORD to encourage further consideration and discussion of the international aspects of environmental problems. The remarks follow:

CAN THE U.N. LEAD THE ENVIRONMENTAL PARADE?

(Statement of Richard N. Gardner)

Almost everyone is now marching under the banner of environmental defense. The U.N. ought to be marching out in front. It isn't. It joined the parade very late—after the parade had passed its door. Whether and how it can exercise any real leadership in this area is a question that concerns not only environmental specialists but also students of international law and organization.

The U.N. has been painfully slow in coming to grips with environmental problems. For years selected aspects of the human environment were dealt with rather ineffectively by various Specialized Agencies, with no overall direction and no real sense of urgency.

In his address to the General Assembly in September 1963, President Kennedy tried to change all this. He called for a global effort to defend the human environment—to "protect the forest and wild game preserves now in danger of extinction—to improve the marine harvests of food from our oceans—and prevent the contamination of air and water by industrial as well as nuclear pollution."

Nobody at the U.N. responded. And when he died nine weeks later, his hopeful initiative was quietly shelved by the Johnson Administration.

STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE

Not until 1968 was the defense of the human environment again brought before the General Assembly. The Swedish delegation took its historic action in proposing the Conference now scheduled for Stockholm in 1972.

A U.N. response to the environmental challenge is long overdue. While some measures to deal with the environment can be taken by individual nations alone, there are resources that do not belong entirely to any nation—the sea, certain lakes and rivers, migratory animals—whose effective management requires international cooperation. Even management of the environment within the confines of a single nation may benefit from the sharing of national experience.

UNITY OF THE WORLD'S ECOLOGICAL SYSTEM

Moreover, we are finally beginning to recognize that how a nation deals with its national environment is no longer its own and nobody else's business. We are beginning to comprehend the unity of the world's ecological system, which means that all nations may be affected by how any one of them treats its air, water and land.

We are gradually awakening to the realization that all mankind depends on the same scarce and relatively shrinking resource pool, and therefore has an interest in the wise husbanding of resources wherever they may be located. And business firms around the world are beginning to see that they cannot accept the additional costs of antipollution measures unless their overseas competitors do the same.

For all these reasons, the international community will be increasingly involved in environmental issues—even those that have hitherto been regarded as "domestic." Indeed, the most powerful impetus to world order may no longer be the threat of nuclear war, but rather the urgent necessity of new trans-national measures to protect the global environment.

POLE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

What exactly can the U.N. system do about environmental problems?

This is what our distinguished panel of experts is going to tell us today. To help begin our discussion, let me make a few suggestions:

To begin with, the U.N. could undertake a massive program to educate the world's people, particularly political leaders, on the problems of the environment; could sponsor joint research efforts and studies; and could finance the training of specialists to handle different environmental problems.

It could organize a world-wide observation network, using observation satellites and other new technology, to monitor the world's environment on a continuing basis, and it could operate a service for the evaluation and dissemination of this information for all nations.

It could encourage the negotiation of international agreements providing for firm anti-pollution and other environmental commitments so that nations and industries accepting their environmental responsibilities suffer no competitive disadvantage in international trade.

It could insure that multilateral aid programs are carried forward with due regard for their environmental implications, and could encourage the application of environmental safeguards in bilateral aid. (Downstream erosion from the Aswan Dam, we now discover, may wash away as much productive farm land as is opened by the new irrigation systems around Lake Nasser.)

WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAM

Finally, it could establish a U.N. Program for the World Heritage, including scenic, historic and natural resources now in danger of destruction whose survival is a matter of concern to all mankind.

Obviously, each nation should be free to decide whether or not to nominate a property within its territory for inclusion in the Program. At the same time, the community of nations should be free to decide whether or not to accept it.

Countries whose resources were included in the Program would gain the advantage of international advice and financial aid in their development with consequent benefits to their economies as a whole. And the world community would be in a position to safeguard unique and irreplaceable resources—Venice, Angkor Wat, some of the great wildlife reserves of Africa—in which all mankind has a common interest.

ESTABLISHMENT OF "OVERVIEW" COMMITTEE

If the U.N. is to act effectively on environmental problems, a central group of distinguished scientists should be established under the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to evaluate and help coordinate the work of the different U.N. agencies active in this area. The historic pattern of functional specialization contains the danger that ecological interrelationships may not be adequately considered. For example, FAO may vote, as it recently did, to continue use of DDT; but this question needs to be looked at by a group whose thinking is not mainly centered on agricultural productivity. An "overview" committee of experts could take a broader view in evaluating the implications for the environment of new as well as existing scientific discoveries.

If the U.N. is to act effectively on environmental problems, the General Assembly and ECOSOC, acting on the advice of a new environmental committee, will need to have real power to direct the work of the Specialized Agencies—a power that does not exist today. In environment as well as in development, the major U.N. contributors are likely to grow impatient with the historical organizational pattern in which closely related questions are dealt with in piecemeal fashion by competitive and often hostile U.N. bureaucracies.

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY

Awareness of the U.N.'s shortcomings has already led some to seek a substitute means of dealing with environmental problems. Writing in the April 1970 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, George Kennan proposes the creation of an International Environmental Agency run by the rich countries of the world.

This proposal, I submit, is unrealistic and politically naive. The developed countries of the world control less than half of the world's land area. They have no authority to legislate for the territory controlled by others or for the oceans and polar regions which are beyond national jurisdiction. The notion that recommendations or decisions taken on the global environment in a "club" of developed countries would carry sufficient legitimacy to determine the actions of the rest of the world is wholly fanciful to anyone familiar with contemporary developments in international organization.

Although most of the world's pollution is now done by the advanced countries, the actions of the less developed countries can have serious effects on the global environment. As they press forward with their own plans for development, it is vital to their own and the general welfare that they not make all the same mistakes that we have made. Rich and poor countries alike, for example, must be concerned if Middle East countries permit oil pollution from drilling off their coasts or if African countries permit the destruction of their wildlife and natural resources.

Kennan is also wrong in urging that the environmental agency be run by scientists. There is no choice but to engage all nations, developed and less developed, at the political level where firm commitments to national action can be made.

I hope the United States Government will not be tempted to by-pass the U.N. on the environment in favor of smaller, more comfortable forums. It was inappropriate, in my view, for President Nixon to make his first concrete proposal for international cooperation on the environment in NATO. As an organization of limited membership whose principal function is military defense against the Soviet Union, NATO is not well suited to be the centerpiece of our effort in this field.

UNIVERSAL SYSTEM NEEDED

The global environment concerns all nations, regardless of national, ideological, or racial differences. It offers new opportunities to transcend these differences and form a global partnership in which we and the Soviet Union take a leading role. Some work on the environment can be usefully undertaken in regional agencies like NATO and OECD, but a universal problem needs a universal system of organizations to deal with it. The U.N. system, including its regional commissions and Specialized Agencies, is the nearest thing to a universal system we have. The Stockholm Conference provides an additional reason to make it more universal by admitting mainland China and divided states. Let us at least urge the U.N. to invite the Peking regime, the two Germanies, the two Viet Nams, and the two Koreas to participate in the Stockholm meeting.

LUTHER H. HODGES SELECTED AS "MAN OF THE SOUTH"

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year, *Dixie Business* magazine, published by Hubert F. Lee of Decatur, Ga., selects a "Man of the South." The 1969 distinction went to Luther H. Hodges, former Governor of North Carolina and Secretary of Commerce.

Also, in Mr. Lee's current issue there appears an article on the official dedication on May 9 of the Stone Mountain Memorial Carving. It was my honor and pleasure to preside over the dedication and to serve as chairman of an advisory committee for the program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, an article on the honor bestowed upon Mr. Hodges and Mr. Lee's column about the Stone Mountain dedication.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT STONE FACES

The Carvings of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson and Jefferson Davis on the sheer side of Stone Mountain were dedicated May 9, 1970.

And thus the 1909 dream of Mrs. Helen Jemison Plane for a memorial to honor the Confederacy has at last come true.

Mrs. Plane was the great aunt of Robert Jemison, Jr., great Birmingham builder and developer, now in his 90's. I was his guest at Birmingham Rotary when he told me the story years ago.

Members and officials of the United Daughters of the Confederacy turned out in great force and were well pleased when Vice President Agnew said:

"The men we honor here today—Lee, Davis and Jackson, were bonded together in war, and now are bonded together for the ages on a great mountain of granite."

As there is a movement underway to have Jefferson Davis enshrined in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, we applaud Mr. Agnew's declaration.

"In the life of Jefferson Davis, the principle that will be remembered most is dignity in defeat. In the 24 years of his life after the Civil War, the quiet dignity of this American triumphed over all those who would abuse him. It would be well to remember, too, that when religious intolerance caused some to attack Judah Benjamin, Davis elevated him to be his Secretary of State."

Georgia's distinguished Senator Herman Talmadge as Governor helped make the carvings possible, introduced VP Agnew, as well as Post Master General "Red" Blount, who is trying to make use of 1906 ideas of W. D. Boyce to reorganize the Post Office.

Georgia Gov. Lester Maddox announced that Margaret Mitchell had been named to the Georgia "Hall of Fame."

I nominate Helen Jemison Plane, who started it all, while head of the Atlanta Chapter UDC for the honor.

Ben Fortson, Secretary of State received cheers when he led the "Rebel Yell," it was a symbol of unity as well as nostalgia. Ben introduced special guest.

Noble Thomas T. Irvin, my favorite for getting things done, who heads the St. Mt.

Memorial Association and is Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture, called the Dedication meeting to order—all 30,000.

The Choral Concert by the Decatur Civic Chorus and music by the Third Army Band enlivened the ceremonies.

Rep. Ben B. Blackman, introduced Senator Herman Talmadge, who presided.

Senator Richard B. Russell and Phil Campbell were in Athens, Ga. for dedication of the \$11 million Richard B. Russell Agriculture Center. Clifford Hardin declared it a "lasting tribute to the Georgia Giant," in his Athens talk.

Dr. Green led the invocation. Dr. Wm. Holmes Borders said the Benediction.

My old friend Gutzon Borglum was the first, Augustus Lukeman the second and Walker Hancock the third sculptor who worked to carve Helen Jemison vision on Stone Mountain.

Success of the dedication was due to the many who did the planning and the work—including Tom Elliott, General Manager, Bill McKinney, his assistant and Mrs. Sara Stilwell, Public Relations.

Both my grandfathers were in the Confederate army and I never pass through Vicksburg but I remember grandfather John Simeon Fowler, born Aug. 1, 1831, died Aug. 9, 1911, who fought at Vicksburg.

I remember and every boy in my neighborhood still living remembers grandfather Fowler's great six shooter, fired by caps which still had a lead bullet in one of its chambers. As I walked down the street with that gun hanging on a rope around my waist, mothers would call their children into the backyards.

LUTHER HODGES "1969 MAN OF THE SOUTH" (By Garland B. Porter)

Luther Hartwell Hodges, one of the most distinguished North Carolinians of his time, is the "1969 Man of the South" and elected to the "South's Hall of Fame For The Living" by Dixie Business Magazine, as announced by Hubert F. Lee, who founded Dixie Business in 1929. Published at Decatur, Ga., suburban Atlanta, Dixie Business seeks to honor men who have contributed conspicuously to the South during their lifetime, so they personally may derive some satisfaction in knowing their work has been appreciated by their contemporaries.

Mr. Hodges, who was born in Pittsylvania County, Va., March 9, 1898, entered politics after retiring from a successful career with Marshall Field & Co., became Governor of North Carolina, and Secretary of Commerce of the U.S. and was graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1919, and was accorded doctorate degrees by a number of universities and colleges. He has been financial and economics consultant in the international as well as national field and has served on many committees, among them Presidential appointments.

Having inspired the Research Triangle of North Carolina, while Governor of the State, he served as Chairman of the Board afterward.

DISTURBANCE BY OUR COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recent disturbances by our college students have caused many of us to ponder the reasons why our young people have found it necessary to take this course of action to express their dissatisfaction with their Government.

Not only has the news media launched into a full-scale analysis of the situation, but private citizens as well have obviously taken some time to puzzle over this serious matter. For the interest and information of my colleagues, I am inserting a copy of a letter which I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Hugh Smith, in which he questions the educational system which has produced such actions by our young people. The dangers and failures of mass education are examined in the May 25, 1970, issue of the Geisinger Indicator in the article "Overcrowding the Schools" which I am also inserting in the RECORD:

TO: THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN AMERICA

The recent deaths of four students at Kent State University is of great concern and sorrow to all Americans. Subsequent information on this tragic happening, which has not been widely publicized, indicates that there were certain unidentified forces at work which probably had a great deal to do with the final result. Student leaders (?) all over the country cry "Peaceful Demonstration." Would any reasonable person call burning of the R.O.T.C. building and the throwing of bricks, rocks and iron pipes peaceful demonstration. They forget that David slew Goliath with a stone.

It now appears that we should look into the underlying reasons for campus unrest. It is reliably reported that the so called "militant students" comprise only about 3% of the total college student body. What motivates this 3% is most difficult to determine. But what about the other 97%? Why do they follow the militant group and become involved in riots and not so peaceful demonstrations? The first stone must be cast at home environment and upbringing. The so called "permissive" atmosphere leads to no respect for any type of authority and ultimately to no respect for the law. The second finger must be pointed at college administrators and faculties. The administrators have been very weak-kneed where student demands have far exceeded legitimate demands. They have almost condoned violence, arson and other criminal activities. Certain faculty members have, under the guise of intellectual freedom, encouraged and abetted activities going far beyond peaceful demonstration. There is little taught in the colleges today which emphasizes that this country was made great by respect for law and order, and transgressors were punished. Could anyone in this country be proud of the "Chicago Seven" during their trial?

What is all this "Anti-Establishment" business? From all the news accounts, this is entirely negative. What programs do they propose for improvement of society?

Why not work for betterment rather than trying to tear down what is already here? We often hear that college students today are probably more intelligent, better educated and less likely to accept established mores. Assuming all of this to be true, the essential ingredient missing is maturity and experience. Many of these young people cannot distinguish truth from a lie, truth from half truth or exaggeration from actual fact. They say to the President, "Stop your staff from criticizing youth," yet this is in direct contrast to their criticism of most anything that comes to mind.

The Indo-China war seems to bring out the worst in the student group and also among many others. No right thinking person likes war. General Sherman (not a very popular historical figure in my home state of Georgia) said, "War is hell." In every war this country has ever fought, there have been dissenters. In the Revolutionary War, there were many Tories. The Mexican War was depicted as helping only the land hungry Texans. What war was more tragic than the

War Between the States when Americans killed Americans. The Spanish-American War could be termed aggression. World Wars I and II could be characterized as "pulling Europe's chestnuts out of the fire." We can probably all now agree that Indo-China is most unfortunate. It appears we slipped into this situation without really realizing it. The student protests, what lies behind them? With the males, is it no feeling of obligation to country, personal fear, an inconvenience to their personal plans or a true and honest moral protest against the war? With the females, is it also lack of obligation to country, loss of boyfriends, an appeal to their motherhood instinct or moral protest? There is much evidence that reasons other than honest moral protest are very substantial.

No man wants to go to war and risk his life. Every normal man is afraid. Having served over four years in the army during World War II and having participated in every campaign in the European Theater, I know from personal experience. What really worries me in this entire area is, were this country to face a situation of war or be conquered or destroyed, would our youth say "this country is not worth fighting for."

This entire writing, so far, has concerned youth. There are many others in this country who are just as bad, if not worse. There are those dissident groups who riot, loot, pillage, burn and inflict personal injury or death. We all are against organized crime—are they any worse than the Black Panthers? There are those in public office who hear only the dissident voices and say "Go along with them, this means votes, or this should help my political ambitions. The silent majority won't care." Some of these same people are so prejudiced that, in effect, no southern judge can be nominated and affirmed for the Supreme Court. What kind of people are we sending to Washington? Could they stand a full exposure of all facets of their private and public lives as occurred when two southern judges were nominated for the Supreme Court?

Many of these same people now propose to tie the hands of the military in Indo-China, very possibly at risk of lives of our fighting men. What qualifies some of our senators to proclaim themselves great military strategists? Furthermore, they, in effect, say the President has lied to the American people and cannot be trusted. Why not wait and see? This proposed action in the Senate is about the most infamous since the attempt to impeach President Johnson.

I would say to the silent majority, "Be silent no more." Raise your voices louder than the dissidents. Exercise your vote and throw the "money changers" out of the temple in Washington or wherever they may be. And finally, those of you who are parents, raise your children to love and respect our country.

HUGH E. SMITH.

ATLANTA, GA.

OVERCROWDING THE SCHOOLS

The long term effects of overcrowding our schools is perhaps the least understood phenomenon in our society. In fact, the chief occupation of our economic machine appears to have been educating technicians to service the vast complexity called civilization through intensive experimentation. To educate all persons to be equally capable and efficient has been the unquestioned goal for many years.

The recent large scale rioting by otherwise normally intelligent young people raises the question where have we failed? The issues the students raise are only temporarily relevant, for the cause obviously lies much deeper.

What one observes is that increasingly higher education of masses of students have transformed most, if not all, who have undergone it into real enemies of present day

society and provided recruits for the worst forms of socialism.

Rethinking the meaning of education, which is study and research of the lessons of both past, present and future, one soon realizes that this is a lonely occupation and not necessarily suited to mass production via computers and massive halls.

Thus, one is drawn to the conclusion that there exists a fundamental error in the theory that Intelligence is increased by rote recital of textbooks, and true and false tests. Also at fault is Parental Indifference by parents too busy living their own lives.

Observing how our forefathers for thousands of years acted to bring about civilization, one finds that they did so by seeing a need and then finding a method to do the job.

This requires some basic qualities within an individual such as Common Sense, Initiative and Experience from association with what was to be done. Little or no formal textbook education was usually required except apprenticeship to an able man before then.

The way our forefathers handled overpopulation was to organize its youth into two groups, usually by the year of birth, those who trained to become warrior-merchants and those who remained with the parent tribe. Periodically, whenever the food supply or opportunities for jobs decreased, the tribe split and those who left fought and died in the attempt to gain new lands for themselves and their children.

Since there are relatively few new resources in the form of lands not occupied, most moderns have turned to intensive development of their own areas, which yielded results for a generation or so, but whose future bounty is now questioned.

So unusually large numbers of young adults, far more than needed for research and development and formal leadership, are resenting their confinement to institutions of higher learning without obtaining personal satisfaction from learning.

Learning by rote or textbook over a prolonged time leads only to boredom and under the rules of good advertising repetition of an assertion, no matter how fraudulent, will be accepted in time by most everyone. Now the acquisition of knowledge without a use for it is the surest way to drive a person to rebellion. Since the experiences and values of one generation, especially during periods of great change, are not relevant to vaguely understood new conditions, the climate for the appearance of a masterful, narrowminded, self assertive leader has been set. This is where the news media, especially the TV system, mindlessly elevates the most emotional and violent in its attempts to reach the sensational. Thus, once upon returning to a campus as a homogenous crowd, the rioting occurs over and over again as contagion spreads. In every age there are those politicians who make use of the contagions of their time to turn tide of fortune their way. The Pled Pipers of "Peace at any price" have led as many nations to oblivion as did those who lead them into unnecessary wars.

No doubt many a harrassed University President is glad that he does not live under the rules of Ancient Greece which held the teacher responsible for the actions of their pupils throughout their lifetimes. Perhaps you have forgotten that Socrates was forced to drink the poison Hemlock because his star pupil, Alcibiades, offended the Athenians too often. Impatience of those militantly minded youth on campus is trying to turn the seat of learning into a cutting edge of social change.

If their University Administrators fall into the trap of politics they will have forfeited their traditional role in society for a mess of potage as they are shunted ignobly aside by the more able professional politician seizing the opportunity to gain favor with the impatient.

The problem is not easily solved, but it is obviously one of fundamental error in trying to overeducate everybody until nobody is educated for what has to be done.

AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY AND THE NATION'S SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the important by-products of the aerospace age has been the ability of several aerospace companies to adapt their technology and know-how to the solving of the Nation's socioeconomic problems. One such company is the Thiokol Chemical Corp., which maintains a large job corps center in the State of Utah.

A good friend of mine, Robert L. Marquardt, group vice president of the Economic Development Operations of Thiokol Chemical Corp., has written an article for the June 1970, issue of Social Service Outlook, the official publication of the New York State Department of Social Services.

Mr. Marquardt explains in some detail how his company and other companies are helping to solve these important problems. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Social Dividends of Aerospace," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOCIAL DIVIDENDS OF AEROSPACE

(By Robert L. Marquardt)

The Apollo 13 mission and the miracle of the technologies and systems that guided three human beings over a quarter-million miles of space has dramatically focused everybody's attention on our aerospace program, its significance—a significance, I want to underline, for everyone, not only small coterie of scientists—and its relevance for everyday life, not only for aerospace disciplines.

I cannot accept the increasingly widespread belief that progress in aerospace is necessarily in conflict with progress in the war on poverty or in solving other social ills. We are told more and more often that our industry (by "our industry" I mean aerospace) is distorting national priorities. The accusation has an appealing sound, but I am not sure it has much more than that.

For one thing it is based on the notion that all the money that we spend on defense and space must be subtracted from what we can spend on other needed projects . . . and vice versa.

These alternatives, however, do not accurately picture the real situation. The main weakness of the argument, in my view, is that it overlooks the creative role that expenditures on both space and social programs play in generating more resources than they consume.

The other day an economist who manages nearly \$2 billion worth of investments for a group of mutual funds went on record with a forecast of full employment over the next decade. Why this rosy outlook? Why would he bet a \$2 billion portfolio on this cheerful prognosis? Largely, he believes, because our economy will be able to exploit the developments of aerospace technology and research and development.

But while aerospace technology will be creating most of the wealth we need to attack social ills, it does not follow that social programs will simply consume that wealth. Let me give an example and a few figures.

My company is involved in many socioeconomic programs. Among these are an Urban Men's Job Corps Center, at Clearfield, Utah; the Para-Professional Institute in Utah; an Employment Training Center for Indian families, at Roswell, N.M.; start-up of new plants in urban ghettos and in rural areas for hiring the hard-core unemployed; supporting Housing and Urban Development in home occupancy training and new low-cost building materials; managing the Indian Police Academy and numerous other programs.

The role of these projects—to different degrees—is to help men and women who have suffered social, economic, or educational deprivation. We do this by assisting them in making social and personal adjustments, filling in educational and health gaps, providing vocational training, and helping in other ways to equip them for more fruitful and productive lives.

When they come to us, most enrollees are unmotivated as well as undereducated; the majority come from backgrounds of broken homes and welfare support. The prognosis, for most, is a dismal lifetime of the same and the great probability that their offspring will be equally alienated, deprived and economically unproductive.

In less than three years, Thiokol's learning centers alone have placed more than 6,000 "hard-core unemployables" in pretty good jobs. We have reason to believe that most of them . . . not all, unfortunately . . . will acquire the habit of working and that this will replace the previous habit of not working.

Now, if you assume the minimum starting wage rate of \$1.80 an hour, each working individual will earn over \$3,700 a year. If these 6,000 trainees remain at the starting wage level to age 65, their income will be approximately \$1 billion.

The alternative? Welfare payments of \$60,000 to \$100,000 per person to age 65. For these 6,000 people, that would add up to \$420 million of welfare.

The figures, of course, are subject to a lot of correction. Some trainees, we know, just won't make it and will drop out again. But on the other side we are currently placing an additional 300 enrollees a month from our various programs and we know that most of our placements will work up to better incomes. Indeed, many are now starting at considerably higher rates, and the least of my problems at the moment is finding good jobs for our graduates.

Perhaps all this sounds like a digression. I prefer to think of it as a slightly roundabout approach to my subject: The research and development gap.

I use the term R & D Gap to express a concern for some of the things that are not being done today and for what this may mean for tomorrow. But my concern is not entirely critical; it is mixed, rather, with a large measure of pride.

CONQUEST OF TIME

I don't think we have to feel excessively humble about acknowledging that we have made mistakes. Our critics never fail to remind us that we have been wrong in some of our forecasts, timetables, budgets and technical developments. If it is any comfort to them, let me say now that we will make more mistakes in the future.

But, I would suggest that one of the greatest contributions of our technology lies precisely in this: We have given the world a new systems approach that allows meaningful decisions to be made not just for today, nor even for tomorrow, but for 10 years or more in the future.

Most people, of course, can be a lot smarter about solving problems of the past than

those of the future. Even the best systems approach can only allow for—but cannot eliminate—new circumstances, changes that may or may not occur, unexpected discoveries, or research programs that do not pan out. But even if you make no allowances for these hazards, I think it is fair to say that our technologists have been spectacularly—even unbelievably—right, far more often than they have been wrong.

In 1961 President Kennedy boldly promised that Americans would land on the moon within that decade. Last year aerospace technology fulfilled his promise in spite of the fact that most of the hardware and a good deal of the needed knowledge did not exist when the President spoke.

Our industry has helped to redeem a number of other "impossible" promises under equally "impossible" schedules. Development of the Minuteman was one that I remember with particular pride since I had the privilege of working on it. The Polaris is another industry blue ribbon. And the list could go on and on.

The significance of such tightly scheduled accomplishments has been completely overlooked by our critics and even by some of our friends. I think it may yet turn out that the greatest achievement of aerospace technology lies *not* in the conquest of space but in the conquest of time.

The instrument of that conquest, as I have already indicated, is systems technology. It consists, essentially, of identifying all the elements of a large and complex problem (for as many of them as possible) and then parceling them out for coordinated and concurrent solutions. It makes use of whatever organizations or individuals seem best qualified to yield the necessary answers and to put the right equipment in the right place at the right time.

There are a number of advantages in utilizing a wide range of talents, wherever they may be found—in government, in public and private institutions, or in private industry. Not the least of the advantages is that this technique makes it possible to exploit existing knowledge and tradition without being restricted by them. And because each contributor approaches a defined aspect of the problem in conventional and unconventional ways, work can move forward—even on pacing items—in broad and time-compressing waves.

PROGRAMMING SOLUTIONS

This important aspect of aerospace, the ability to analyze complex missions, line up problems to be solved years in advance, and then to program the solutions, is almost as important as the solutions themselves.

And it is paying off. Industry and government have been applying these management methods to a wide range of nonaerospace problems. It is not surprising to me that aerospace companies have either taken the lead or made important contributions in medicine and medical technology, in hospital systems, in environmental health and pollution controls, in weather forecasting and in weather modifications, in developing new educational concepts and new teaching equipment, in transportation, in housing, and in developing and exploiting new food resources.

In two of the largest challenges that face our society, I confidently expect to see ever increasing involvement of the systems and technologies that have grown out of the aerospace complex. One of these is that bewildering cluster of unsolvable problems that we call the urban crises, the other is the next great frontier for science and business—the oceans of the world.

Similarities between oceanographic and space research are pretty obvious. At this stage they involve comparable environments and hazards and are even alike in the way vast complexes of systems and people converge and focus dramatically on manned mis-

sions. Scott Carpenter, who switched from astronaut to aquanaut, symbolizes much of this commonality.

It is in areas like these that we may be shortchanging our future by failing to make adequate investments in research and development. I believe that we now have many of the systems that will enable us to manage massive programs. The question that increasingly confronts us is: Do we understand the problems that need to be solved?

RESEARCHING PROBLEMS

In-the-bank research will be needed to forecast possible problems as well as to solve them. It will be needed to buy the lead time that makes effective systems management possible. And it is needed not only to tell us about things we had better not do, or that we should do differently.

Scientists tell us that within a relatively short time we will be able to make accurate long-range forecasts of the weather over large areas of the earth. And not long after that, we may be able to modify weather. Losses caused by weather in the United States are estimated at 1,200 lives and \$11 billion a year, so it would seem obvious that weather research is worth large expenditures. But here, too, I think we need a systems approach that will help us to define—and solve—some of the problems that could arise out of our technology. If this requires more money for research, then budget and spend it.

Our environment is increasingly polluted by the by-products of modern life. We don't yet know the answers to air and water pollution or even to the hazards of our increasingly noisy lives. But it is certainly clear that these problems can only be dealt with as part of a complex of social, economic and technological innovations.

We need research not only to solve known problems, but also to deal with new problems that arise out of the solutions to old ones. We have been warned that mankind is outgrowing his food supply. But it is little appreciated that most food-short countries actually produce—and even harvest—more food than they consume. They break down, however, in methods of preserving, storing, transporting and distributing a significant part of their harvests. In some ways progress can actually complicate this imbalance.

Agricultural research has been steadily increasing staple food output in many countries. India, for example, now has some 40 million acres planted in new strains of rice that yield 10 times as much as older strains. On paper at least, this chronically food-short country could be self-sufficient in staple foods within the next five years.

But there is a difference between sufficiency on paper and in the stomachs of people. Technologies for preserving and distributing food are relatively simple, but they won't just come about. These are jobs for systems management. They call for analysis of a wide range of related problems, the anticipation of developing needs, and arranging to have the necessary solutions available where and when they are wanted.

With so many urgent problems clamoring for attention, action and money, it is hardly surprising that the partisans of one cause should feel hostile to those who advocate another. The talk we hear today about distortion of priorities is not new. It means now what it has always meant—that someone else's pet project is getting more attention than mine.

How many of us push aside a fine lunch because millions of our fellow Americans go without lunch? How deeply do we feel our responsibility for the fact that so many of our fellow citizens are living in poverty where malnutrition is evident and increasing?

Left in untroubled comfort, it might be quite a while before we spontaneously decided to take any major action to change

this condition. Yet I'm sure that academically and intellectually we all know that hunger is wrong and intolerable.

In the great capitalist tradition, some of the underprivileged have lately taken to lobbying for their interests. I hope I don't have to emphasize to you that I thoroughly disapprove of lawlessness, that I hold no brief for looting, burning and the destruction of property. But I am even less sympathetic to the idea that we can deal with the growing malignancy of poverty in this country merely by denying it or by suppressing the protestors.

And while I have been emphasizing here the need for broad research in great clusters of problems, I want to make it clear that this should never be an excuse for sitting on our hands. Even before we have fully defined all the elements that need attention, we can and should address ourselves to those that are immediately visible.

NEW APPROACHES

Within the small frame as well as in the large, systems management can yield important benefits while helping to define the broader areas of investigation. It can, in fact, greatly alter our conception of the problems to be solved. Let me give you an example.

At the time Thiokol began its Job Corps operations, we naturally studied hard what educators and social scientists knew about the problems we would be facing and the people we would be working with. On the basis of the best available research at that time, Job Corps headquarters in Washington took the position that no more than five percent of the Corps population had the social or educational background to attain high school educational certification. We were advised to structure our programs accordingly.

Naturally we listened. But we didn't stop there. One of the lessons we had learned in the aerospace business was to be serious about research, but not solemn or uncritical. We decided to take nothing for granted. In the past, when we went into those remote areas that are most suitable for testing big rocket engines, we had had to recruit propellant technicians out of populations of beet farmers and shrimp fishermen. We had been quite successful in training our employees in new skills; we even thought our experience might have been as relevant as that of the educational experts since all our training work has been tailored to the needs of adults.

SETTING UP PROGRAMS

One of the first things we learned in setting up our educational programs for the Job Corps was that Ph. D. instructors were not necessarily the best choice for communicating with fifth-grade dropouts. So in many cases we recruited production workers and trained them to be teachers. We adopted and adapted educational devices and teaching aids; and when we couldn't find suitable ones, we invented our own. We concentrated on motivation and the pacing of education to the vocational needs of the individual.

In brief, we followed much of our old rule book: In an R & D project you must first try to identify the problem. You determine what isn't working, and why. You examine the state of the art and relate available technology to the function to be performed. You decide whether new technologies are needed and try to figure out how to develop them. You quantify your answers in explicit detail and plan a program to achieve the defined objectives.

How has this approach worked? Today, 20 percent of the young men who pass through our Clearfield Job Corps Center earn high-school diplomas or equivalency certificates. This is *four times* what conventional educational research had told us was possible. The diplomas and certificates, I might add, are issued by Utah county and state

educational agencies so we have no opportunity to load the results in our favor. Nor do we have to color another fact: More than 200 of our past dropouts have already entered college on scholarships.

Our brief experience in this field has made us confident that systems approaches can break through conventional educational and motivational barriers. We are betting thousands of dollars on it. Since the first of this year we have been operating the Clearfield Job Corps Center on an incentive contract, the first ever written for the educational program. We guaranteed performance.

Does this term sound familiar? It ought to. Incentive contracts are borrowed directly from the aerospace industry. We think the idea of quantifying educational results has revolutionary implications for the entire knowledge industry. And we know some disinterested educators who feel even stronger about it than we do.

Much of the aerospace industry is active in these new frontiers. Lockheed has applied aerospace management techniques to hospital systems; Avco has applied them to water resources management; Ling-Temco-Vought to business and vocational schools; General Dynamics to waste disposal; Westinghouse to the training and ground transportation areas, and scores of other companies have attempted solutions to scores of other social problems.

DISTANT PROBLEMS

Unfortunately, the idea seems to be around that expenditures for R & D are just sly ways of dipping into the pork barrel. It is not always easy to disprove this notion, especially when we are working on problems that may not even become visible for five or 10 years.

But that, in essence, is what R & D is all about, or at least, a large part of it. If we had not solved those invisible, or barely visible, problems years in advance and had research stored, Apollo would not have gone to the moon last year.

The urban and environmental problems that now face us are greater than any we have encountered in the past in aerospace. Yet in many years R & D funding is actually diminishing instead of expanding to the new needs and opportunities.

Recognizing all the difficulties created by conflicting pressures and priorities—and by the need to support our commitment in Vietnam until it can be safely reduced—it seems to me that lowered levels of R & D funding could turn into very expensive savings.

Ongoing programs for discovering opportunities, as well as for solving problems, will become increasingly essential to our physical well-being as well as to our survival and freedom. And on the record of history, R & D spending is the best investment America can make.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART XIII

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are concerned about the unrestrained international trade in arms, I recommend a recent article in *Business Week* magazine.

The article provides the reader with all the latest facts and figures, and examines the most significant trends in the trade. Seldom have I read such a superior article covering so complicated a topic and written in so concise a fashion.

I urge those who are unfamiliar with the arms trade problem to read this article so that they may acquire an appre-

ciation of the trade's size and scope, and the dangers it poses to us all:

[From *Business Week* magazine, May 23, 1970]

THE BOOMING WORLD TRADE IN ARMS

Last week, the U.S. agreed to sell 16 A-4B Skyhawk jets to Argentina for \$5-million, and decided in principle to sell both Skyhawks and F-5 fighters to Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.

In Moscow, meanwhile, the Kremlin was mulling over the consequences of its sale of additional MIGs and SAM-3 antiaircraft missiles to Egypt.

In Paris, the French followed up the sale of more than 100 Dassault Mirage 3C fighters to Libya and another 30 to Spain, with 16 to Brazil.

And in London, the British were anticipating additional sales of Hawker Siddeley V/STOL aircraft to the U.S. Marine Corps that could run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

In all, it was another busy week in the international arms business. And while no nation seems likely to catch up immediately with the U.S., the world's No. 1 arms salesman, the deals reflect the growing competition from Russia, France, and Britain.

In the quarter century since the end of World War II, some \$66-billion worth of conventional arms have been pumped into world markets. Close to \$50-billion of those weapons have come from the U.S., which achieved its status mainly through military aid programs bolstering allies during the cold war. Side by side, Washington has also mounted an aggressive campaign to sell arms abroad.

Now, however, because of mounting criticism in Congress, the Pentagon is shifting tactics and is urging industry to take on more of the arms sales job. "In view of growing Congressional concern over U.S. arms exports programs, the government is playing down its role and expecting industry to take up the slack," says a Pentagon official frankly. "It's more in keeping with the times."

NEW EMPHASIS

New and little-publicized guidelines for U.S. foreign-arms sales were laid down in mid-February by Ronald I. Spiers, director of the State Dept.'s Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs. Under his directive, the government will henceforth curb its active arms-sales promotion and will wait instead for customer nations to ask to buy arms.

When they do, however, U.S. embassies and Washington officials have a free rein to encourage arms purchases directly from U.S. companies. Control will be exercised through the use of export licenses and the government will try to avoid involving itself in the sales terms.

It remains to be seen how the new government rules will affect total sales of U.S. arms. The new regulations come on top of limitations imposed on U.S. arms exports by Congress. Grants and sales to Latin America, for example, are not supposed to exceed \$75-million annually; the yearly ceiling for Africa is \$40-million.

Sales of "sophisticated weapons" to underdeveloped countries are still prohibited, though Congress has not defined the term. "What's sophisticated to Upper Volta clearly isn't sophisticated to Argentina," a Pentagon official notes wryly.

TOP DOG

Despite the new limitations, however, the U.S. is not expected to lose its lead in the near future. American arms sales, which have exceeded grants since 1962, run up to \$2.6-billion annually. About 50% of these have been handled by the Pentagon, while 30% have involved direct dealings between U.S. manufacturers and foreign nations. The remaining 20% required direct credit or guarantees provided by the U.S. government.

In addition, a small business in arms is done by private dealers, who buy and sell surplus weapons and spare parts.

The major buyers of U.S. arms are the European countries, Canada, Japan, Australia, and a few oil-rich Middle Eastern nations. Only about 20% of the sales are to underdeveloped countries.

FMC Corp.'s M-113 armored personnel carrier and the Lockheed F-104 and Northrop F-5 fighters typify American arms sales success stories. The M-113 has been marketed in such nations as Australia, Canada, Denmark, West Germany, Iraq, Jordan, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Italy. More than 2,200 F-104s fly in the air forces of 14 nations, and about 1,100 F-5s have been built or are on order for 16 nations. The U.S. has sold 8,000 Philco-Ford Sidewinder air-to-air missiles abroad as well as 2,000 Raytheon Sparrow air-to-air missiles.

Not all export deals have gone off as expected. Britain canceled an order for 50 General Dynamics F-111 fighter-bombers after adopting a less ambitious military strategy. Australia is buying 24, but because of the plane's technical problems, Canberra is planning to lease 24 F-4s as stand-ins.

New sales possibilities continue to open up, though Switzerland is in the final throes of deciding whether to buy the Ling-Temco-Vought A-7 attack plane or the Fiat G-91 from Italy. Holland is considering the Northrop P-530, which is not yet in production, and Lockheed's CL-981, along with French and Swedish competitors.

BALANCE

As it has been increasing its arms sales effort, the U.S. has been operating a declining program of arms grants. These dipped to \$589-million in the past fiscal year from \$1.2-billion five years ago. Most of the weapons giveaways go to "forward defense" countries near the Communist bloc, such as South Korea, Nationalist China, Turkey, and Greece. In the past year, aid recipients picked up another \$117-million worth of arms and equipment that had been declared surplus to U.S. needs and sent to government disposal yards to be scrapped.

These programs represent what might be called normal arms exports activities. But Congress also appropriates \$2.5-billion annually for a special Pentagon fund to equip South Vietnamese, Thai, and Laotian forces in support of the Vietnam war. One measure of the program's size: The U.S. Air Force in the coming fiscal year will buy more aircraft for export to Southeast Asia—Cessna T-37 small jets and Bell UH-1 helicopters, for example—than it will buy for itself.

In addition, the Pentagon is quietly moving to tighten the American grip on the military-aircraft market in the Far East. In mid-June, the Air Force will select the winner in a competition to build a new International Fighter. This is to be an easy-to-fly, easy-to-maintain supersonic fighter for South Korea, Nationalist China, South Vietnam, and Thailand to enable them to combat the Asian Communist bloc's Soviet MIG-21 more effectively.

Northrop, McDonnell Douglas, Lockheed, and Ling-Temco-Vought are the main competitors for the initial 325-plane order. But the free-world market for light fighter-ground attack aircraft—now dominated by Northrop's F-5—is huge, and the winner of the International Fighter competition probably will be able to sell it far beyond Asia.

As U.S. industry reaches out for such global customers, it is sure to run into greater competition from many foreign governments. But its biggest challenge is undoubtedly the Soviet Union. Western intelligence sources estimate that in the past few years Russia has been selling more than \$1.5-billion worth of arms annually to developing countries alone. There are no reliable figures on the scope of its aid or sales to Warsaw Pact allies.

MOSCOW'S MUSCLE

Russia sells or barter arms to nations outside its own bloc rather than giving them away, and deals mainly in aircraft and missiles. As a result, Moscow stores, which regularly run out of green vegetables during winter, are stuffed with pineapples and pineapple juice. The fruit comes from North Vietnam in part payment for AK-47 rifles and PT-76 tanks, and for the MIG-21s, 100-mm antiaircraft guns, and surface-to-air missiles which Russia supplies to the Hanoi regime to give it one of the most formidable air-defense systems ever encountered by U.S. aircraft.

Moscow shops currently also are flooded with stuffed footrests from Egypt, which are probably part of an arms barter deal.

North Vietnam and Egypt each account for about one-third of Russia's military aid. The remaining third is split between such countries as India, Algeria, Syria, Iraq, and Cuba. Soviet aid to Cuba since 1960 has included about 130 MIG-17s, 19s, and 21s; about 200 T-54 tanks and 60 assorted Navy aircraft, including 18 Komar-class guided-missile boats.

The Soviets currently are expanding their trade efforts into new markets, however. Moscow apparently has broken Jordan's long reliance on American and British arms after offering to supply King Hussein with anti-aircraft guns, machine guns, and rifles. Western sources also expect Russian arms sales soon to Saudi Arabia, another traditional British-American buyer.

Moreover, the Soviets, along with the British and French, are challenging U.S. arms dominance in Latin America, wooing Peru and Bolivia in particular. The Russians do not hesitate to undercut American prices. They are peddling their T-54 tank, for example, at \$100,000; the U.S. equivalent, the M-48, costs twice that much.

FRANCE'S EFFORT

Lagging behind the Soviets, but just as aggressive, are the French, who rank as the world's third-largest arms exporters. Last year, their trade dropped some 37%, largely because of their embargo on shipments to Israel. But the outlook has now brightened with Mirage sales to Libya, Spain, and Brazil this year. Paris expects 1970 to be as good as, if not better than, the \$800-million arms-sales record it chalked up in 1968.

In choosing its weapons designs, France looks not only at how well they will fill national defense needs, but their export potential. This explains why Avions Dassault has sold 700 Mirages to a dozen foreign air forces against 300 at home. The same is true of France's popular Alouette turbine helicopter. Nearly 30 overseas customers have bought 1,286 Alouettes, compared with 614 purchased by the French armed forces.

In addition to tailoring their weapons for export, the French make sales more tempting with incentives. They cut interest rates on recent Mirage deals, for example, from the usual 8% to 3.5%. When Belgium bought license rights to the Mirage, the French promised Belgian industry participation in future French aircraft programs.

Until their self-imposed ban on arms sales to Israel last year, the French had never paid much attention to embargoes declared by other nations. In 1963, when the United Nations declared that arms that could be used to enforce apartheid should not be sent to South Africa, the U.S. and Britain adhered to the ban, but the French promptly made South Africa one of their biggest customers. In fact, the government in Pretoria largely financed French development of a new missile, the Crotale, and France recently had to clear a sale of the missile to Lebanon with South Africa.

Nor does France hesitate to take advantage of a customer nation's disenchantment with its traditional suppliers. It sewed up the Mirage deal with Libya when the new military regime there showed a more pro-

Egyptian stance in the Arab-Israeli conflict and turned from Britain and the U.S. as suppliers.

THE BRITISH

The French have taken over some traditional British markets. But Britain, the fourth-largest arms supplier, has managed to double its international sales from an estimated \$240-million three years ago to an estimated \$480-million now. Arms deals negotiated by the government now amount to 28% of Britain's total exports. To make it easier for foreign countries to buy British, the government produces a catalogue entitled *British Defense Equipment*, which covers everything from aircraft, ships, and tanks to sleeping bags and fire-fighting equipment.

Britain's principal arms customers tend to be former Commonwealth countries and nations in the Middle East. In the past two years, Britain has sold frigates to New Zealand; Hawker Hunter fighters, Centurion tanks, and Tigercat surface-to-air missiles to Jordan; Lightning fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia; and Tigercat missiles to the Persian Gulf sheikhdom of Qatar.

Along with France and Russia, Britain also has been making inroads in Latin America with the sale of Canberra bombers to Peru, submarines to Brazil; and a \$7.2-million contract announced in January to build frigates and submarines for Chile. Last year, a British export task force with an exhibition ship visited Latin America to talk about arms sales.

ALSO-RANS

The remaining portion of the world arms market is shared by Italy, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, West Germany, Belgium, and Israel, although it is relatively insignificant. Many of these countries' sales are made to nations that prefer to stay independent from the major powers. Among the items they buy are Belgian FN rifles, Swedish jets, missiles, and cannon, Italian Fiat G-91 jets, and Israeli UZI submachine guns, which also have been sold to the U.S. Secret Service.

In January, West Germany sold 600 of its speedy 40-ton Leopard tanks to Italy under an arrangement whereby Italy will build about 82% of the tank. The Leopard has also beaten out the Chrysler M-60 in sales to Belgium, Norway, and the Netherlands. Aside from the Fiat jet, Italy manages to sell light arms and munitions to its European neighbors. And in addition to a SAAB J-35 fighter deal with Denmark, Sweden has sold the SAAB 105 reconnaissance-strike aircraft to Austria.

Sweden, because of its neutrality, tries not to sell arms to countries engaged in combat. It now regrets having set up a factory for Egypt in the 1950s to make the Carl Gustaf machine gun, which today is a standard Egyptian weapon. In another deal, Sweden delivered a large number of antitank guns to Australia, which are now being used in Vietnam. Sweden is refusing to supply ammunition for the guns as a protest against Australia's involvement in the war.

THE FUTURE

In the 1970s, the international arms business is expected to take on a new character. One reason is that Western Europe has launched a number of cooperative development ventures to reduce its dependence on American arms. These efforts have a spotty record so far, but the trend will probably continue because modern weaponry is becoming so expensive.

Britain, Germany, and Italy are cooperating in the development of an advanced jet fighter known as MRCA (for Multi-Role Combat Aircraft) to save money. Britain and France—in a similar joint-development program—have started production of the Jaguar strike aircraft.

Britain and Germany are collaborating on development of a 155-mm towed gun; Britain and France are working on the Martel air-

to-air missile; and France and Germany have joined forces to produce the Roland surface-to-air missile.

In addition, some industrialized nations buying U.S. arms are starting to demand more licensing arrangements with American companies as part of arms deals. Washington recognizes that cooperative ventures as well as licensing agreements will drive down sales to developed nations. But it anticipates that sales to less-developed countries will increase in the 1970s; military aid programs are expected to level off at about \$350 million annually.

THIRD WORLD

One expert on the international trade in arms—Geoffrey Kemp, formerly of London's Institute for Strategic Studies and now at the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology—foresees another trend developing. In the underdeveloped "third" world, he says, defense expenditures and levels of armament will continue to grow, but at a slower rate. He sees the emergence of more supplier nations—Japan, for example—suggesting that a buyers' market may be the phenomenon of the 1970s.

In any case, the U.S. will find a rising demand for more advanced weapons in the third world, even if the total world demand for its arms slackens. In 1955, no developing country had supersonic military planes; by 1968, 29 did. In 1957, no developing country had long-range surface-to-air missiles; by 1968, 18 did. The trend seems clear.

WHERE U.S. WEAPONS GO

[Value of shipments]

	Millions of dollars
Fiscal 1969:	
West Germany.....	525
Iran	184
Japan	81
Italy	74
Republic of China.....	38
Canada	36
Greece	36
Australia	34
NATO	33
Spain	30
Great Britain	28
Norway	28
Switzerland	27
France	25
Argentina	19
Chile	13
Belgium	11
Brazil	10
Morocco	10
Netherlands	8
Denmark	4
Libya	3
New Zealand	3
South Africa	3
India	2
Venezuela	2
Peru	1
Classified countries	1

Classified countries include Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan. Data: Defense Department.

WHO SUPPLIES THE WEAPONS

[Annual volume of arms shipments in millions of dollars]

Nation	Total shipments	Shipments to developing nations
United States.....	2,600	670
Soviet Union (estimated).....	2,000	600
France	500	200
Great Britain	305	135
Italy (estimated).....	100	35
West Germany (estimated).....	80	50
Canada (estimated).....	60	30
Switzerland.....	26	5
Sweden	20	7
All other (estimated).....	150	100

THE DEALERS WHO ARE CASHING IN

"The private arms industry is really a joke compared to the government side of the business," says Samuel Cummings, founder and president of International Armaments Corp. (Interarms). "We just get a few crumbs from the master's table."

But those "few crumbs" have been enough to make Cummings the world's largest private dealer in military small arms and a very wealthy man.

For nearly 20 years, Cummings, a gun buff since he learned to take apart and re-assemble a World War I German machine gun at age five, has bought up small arms that governments declare surplus and sold them to other countries.

Interarms stores its weapons in 10 warehouses with over 100,000 sq. ft. of space a few miles south of the White House and the Pentagon on the Virginia side of the Potomac River. It also operates a large reconditioning and converting plant and still other huge warehouses in a London suburb.

Cummings, a big man with a quick grin and frequent flashes of ironic humor who looks more like an art dealer than an arms trader, is secretive about the size of his company's sales. "Our aim is to say we've had a \$100-million year. We've never made it, but we've come fairly close."

ESSENTIAL FOLLY

Moreover, Cummings expects his business to have a long life, based as it is on "the essential folly of the arms race itself." "We're in a business that's guaranteed to last forever," he says. Sometimes, the surplus arms he buys are in their original delivery package. "They're for sale simply because some politician thinks he has to have the latest chrome-plated version." Sometimes they have passed through many hands and many countries before Cummings gets them.

Interarms refuses to give many specifics. But Venezuela and the Royal Thai Navy have been among its recent customers. And the company has just bought 200,000 outmoded light weapons of many origins—U.S., British, French, German, Japanese—collected by South Vietnam since World War II.

Interarms also recently bought a large quantity of surplus ammunition from Indonesia. Though modern, the ammunition can no longer be used by Indonesia since that country adopted a more modern Western military look. But it can be marketed in Latin America and elsewhere.

COMPETITORS

Other companies have specialties in the international arms business. When a foreign government needs hard-to-find spare parts for certain U.S.-made military equipment, for example, chances are it will turn for help to Astra Aircraft Corp., of New York City, founded 10 years ago by a former airline flight engineer, M. D. Acosta. Astra maintains a detailed card file on millions of aircraft and ordnance components made by U.S. manufacturers. Its reference system covers items from rocket launchers to radio antennas to parachutes.

If a foreign government does not know where to obtain needed spares, Astra will not only provide the information, but arrange to find the components in the U.S., buy them and resell them to the overseas customer.

Another private international arms dealer is NAPCO Industries, Inc., of Hopkins, Minn. A diversified company in the automotive field, NAPCO boasts that it "can supply any part for all U.S. military vehicles made in the last 30 years."

Among NAPCO's principal customers—33-year-old President Gary B. Rappaport calls them his "friendly foreign nations"—are Italy, Greece, Spain, and Israel.

Much of NAPCO's spare parts inventory was picked up over the years as scrap or

production overruns. But what it does not stock, the company will reproduce on order from military blueprints.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS
ROLE IN PEACEKEEPING

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, for the information and possible interest of my colleagues, I insert the text of an address delivered by Vice Adm. Arnold F. Schade, commander, Eastern Sea Frontier and U.S. Delegate to the U.N. Military Staff Committee, at an Armed Forces Day banquet in Pittsburgh, Pa., May 15, 1970, before the Military Order of the World Wars:

UNITED NATIONS AND ITS ROLE
IN PEACEKEEPING

To suggest a talk about the United Nations as a force in the world effective in maintaining peace usually gets a little more attraction than a stifled yawn.

We must agree that in many instances it does appear ineffective. People look at the situation in Vietnam and in the Middle East, to mention just two of the hot spots where war is actually being waged, and then say—the United Nations is useless. Well, I would suggest the United Nations as a peacekeeping force merits neither lavish praise nor should it be completely condemned. The United Nations as an instrument for discussion does serve a purpose and, in fact, if we did not have such an organization, there would be tremendous pressure to create one. It has been said that the United Nations became indispensable before it became effective.

Whatever its weaknesses as an international peacekeeping force—and these are well known—the U.N. still provides a forum for discussion, a common meeting ground, and a mirror of world opinion without which international relationships would be even more difficult to reconcile than they are now.

We Americans have come to the full realization that it is neither practicable nor desirable for the United States to attempt to function as the conscience and the enforcement officer to preserve the peace of the world. We are firmly committed to collective security and the President recently reaffirmed the importance of the UN and the need for U.S. leadership in seeking ways to strengthen the organization.

So today I'd like to start with the premise that we work within the framework of the UN—

And recognizing its limitations, show the need for balanced modern U.S. military forces.

With respect to peacekeeping the United Nations was organized essentially to preserve the peace of the world and this remains the primary test of UN effectiveness.

The UN Security Council has never authorized enforcement action or developed the machinery to take action against peace breakers and the proposed arrangements to provide armed forces through agreements between troop contributors and the Security Council have never been materialized.

Military sanctions therefore have never come into play and for that matter economic sanctions which have been applied have not always been effective partially because they have not been universally observed. However, the UN built up ad-hoc arrangements for voluntary peacekeeping, providing for military observers or contingents volunteered by UN members to help stabilize local con-

licts. The UN has made notable contributions to security through peacekeeping actions of this nature in the Middle East, Cyprus, Kashmir, the Congo and elsewhere. The success of these actions has depended on the support or acquiescence of all major powers and the willingness of Canada, Iceland, and Scandinavian countries and others to give political backing and to contribute men and money, and on cooperation by the conflicting parties including consent by host country to the stationing of UN military personnel on its soil.

The total resources of the UN amount to—

At that price you can't buy much law and order all around the world!

Just quickly, to enumerate a few of its achievements, we do have now a nuclear test ban treaty which is designed to help turn down the nuclear arms race, to reduce the possible dissemination of nuclear weapons by limiting nuclear testing, and to prevent radioactive pollution around the world. We have an outer space treaty which bans placement in orbit or stationing in space of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction; we have a nonproliferation treaty which is intended to keep the number of nuclear powers to a minimum—at present five; and it is under the constant badgering and pressures of the smaller nations in the United Nations that the two super powers, America and Russia, have agreed to attempt the reduction in the strategic weapons systems race currently being undertaken in Vienna, known as the SALT talks.

Another area getting serious attention now is the sea beds treaty. I believe that this will result in agreement not to in-place nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the deep ocean floor.

If we observe those areas where the United Nations has fielded military operations—in the past twenty-five years, they have been involved in fourteen—they range in size from a few observers to armed conflict involving one-half million troops in Korea. Essentially there are two kinds of military operations—one is the use of observers to monitor cease fire and armistice arrangements, while the other is peacekeeping operations where the UN fields organized military contingents to act as a buffer between warring parties—an example the UN emergency force, on the Israeli-Egypt line from 1957 to 1967—or to prevent civil war and help restore and maintain order, as in Cyprus for the past 6 years and in the Congo in early 1960s. This latter was successfully undertaken in the Congo with some twenty thousand troops, and did in fact establish reasonable peace over a four year period of time.

Now we have three kinds of international situations involving the two super powers which have a direct impact on whether peace can be achieved under any set of circumstances.

The first would be a situation where either the United States or the USSR considers its own national interests to be paramount. For example in Hungary and Czechoslovakia for the Russians, and Cuba for the United States.

A second situation would be with the U.S. and the USSR indirectly involved on opposite sides but not prepared to drag the other into the conflict. This was the case in Korea. It's the case today in South Viet Nam, and there are some elements of this in the middle east. Now in either of the above, it is quite apparent that the UN cannot be fully effective in the case of the Middle East. The UN has been able to play a limited but significant role in bringing about and maintaining a cease fire and in contributing in numerous ways to a lowering of the intensity of the conflict.

The third aspect which does present the UN with an opportunity is where third-power

countries are involved where neither of the super powers have a direct stake. Examples of this would be in Congo, Cyprus, Kashmir and the like.

I think it is interesting to note that a few years ago the smaller nations in frustration demanded that the U.S. and the USSR get together and settle their differences so that the rest of the world could get on with improving economy and their standard of living. To a certain degree this has taken place so that today the U.S. and the USSR are undertaking bilateral and private discussions.

And how do the little nations view this—well, they view this very dimly—they say now that the two superpowers are ganging up on them to make all their decisions for everybody and these decisions are being imposed upon them whether they like it or not.

The UN does have a small force in the Middle East, and it would appear that this would be a fine place for the UN to be effective and bring about some sort of a settlement. Let's look at the Middle East. The Russian objectives appear to me to advance their national interests at the expense of the West—to maintain a continuous state of instability, to arouse animosity against the western powers, and to gain a foothold by expanding their own prestige and influence throughout the entire Mediterranean littoral. They have succeeded pretty well in this. But, it is my opinion that they do not wish to confront the U.S. in the Middle East, nor do they wish to see Israel defeated as a power. For if Israel were to disappear there would be no compelling desire for the Middle East powers to accept Soviet military equipment and direction, and Russia might soon lose much of its current influence in that area. Nor would there be the unifying force through the Arab world, and the resentment against the western world that exists by the presence of Israel. So their objective is to keep it hot but not to let the pot boil over.

Now the U.S. objectives are immediate cease fire, to maintain a balance of power, to preserve the integrity of the state, to restore the peace, to improve the economies of the Middle East states, and to retain U.S. lines of trade, primarily oil at the moment. Unfortunately, the British, who were a stabilizing power, are virtually disappearing in accordance with their policy to abandon everything east of the Suez.

Once again, with these contradicting national objectives, where the Russians want a continuing instability, and the U.S. wants peace and stability, the UN can play only a limited role. Well, where does the UN go from here in peacekeeping?

Disarmament is a very live subject and I would point out that the U.S. is doing a considerable amount unilaterally even though the Russian fleet appears to be growing in a most significant fashion. For example, at the end of fiscal year '69, the U.S. Navy had a fleet of 886 ships. Today we have 761. By the end of fiscal year '71, we will be down to 757. Fortunately, while we are cutting back on those ships approaching twenty-five years of age or more, we do have a very ambitious new construction replacement program. There does appear to be a point, however, when quality cannot compensate for quantity.

The U.S. national interests, of course, must be preserved by the strength of our own Armed Forces. I would be the first to say that NATO has been tremendously effective, but we must look to our own forces to preserve our own national interests both unilaterally and in support of collective security agreements.

I say this in spite of the demonstrations against war which have primarily led to the image of the military man in uniform becoming somewhat tarnished.

The present trend in international affairs reflects the overall presence of power and pressure.

Let it be remembered that in Czechoslovakia, in a single night, Russia violated basic principles of the U.N. Charter, and its own twisted proclamations that it strives for international peace and security.

But what is worse, the Soviets attempted to justify their uncouth actions with a strange doctrine of "limited sovereignty".

The Soviets have told us repeatedly that they intend to build up their navy and their merchant marine. They demonstrate a new understanding of sea power. In the last ten years they have grown from a maritime nonentity to a major sea power.

They can and do operate major forces, both missile firing surface ships, and missile firing submarines in every major ocean.

If their capabilities are known, it is true that the intentions of their political leaders are unknown.

It is also true that the military capabilities require years to develop but political intentions can change abruptly.

As I stated earlier, we have taken steps to cut back our overall military strength. There are certain risks in these military cuts. There are many who believe that Communism is an ideology which can be fought with intellectual weapons, overlooking the fact that Communism is so often imposed by brute force. So we must not only use intellectual weapons but we must be ready to confront Communism with sufficient physical force to be a credible deterrent.

In more than twenty years of cold war, deterrence has been only partly successful in that we have not had a nuclear war, but there has been plenty of violence.

Now we are moving ahead with the strategic arms limitation talks to limit strategic weapons. Secretary of State Rogers said (1 December 1969): "The U.S. will enter these negotiations with serious purpose and with the hope that we can achieve balanced understandings that will benefit the cause of world peace and security. Yet we begin these negotiations knowing that they are likely to be long and complicated and with the full realization that they may not succeed."

For the U.S. to be meaningful and beneficial in today's world; to shoulder the responsibilities and duties that result from the right of a free people: to be able to act: all these require the active presence of the United States.

We need two elements of military "presence." One is to confront the major communist powers with strong, versatile, highly mobile, and constantly ready military forces to discourage any type of aggressive action. This need will be with us for a long time. The other equally important need is the deterrent force we can provide to support the security of the smaller and less powerful nations from further aggressions—whether this be overtly military or by subversion and infiltration.

Under the Nixon doctrine as set forth by the President we will observe our treaty commitments, and we will provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of an ally or a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security. In cases, involving other types of aggression, we shall help, in accordance with our treaty commitments but we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense.

I state this in full realization of the restraints on the use of power and the violent resentment against military action in today's world. The U.S. cannot unilaterally wield its military power beyond the political and moral limits which govern our Nation. It is my firm belief that these constraints, whether self-imposed by moral consciousness or dictated by political realities, do not invalidate the need for selective continued U.S. military presence abroad, but, rather, reinforce that need.

The Mediterranean Basin and the eastern arc of Asia are the two most critical and dangerous parts of the world. In both of these our military "presence" in fully respected strength is needed. It may well prove to be the determining factor in preventing further bloodshed.

Vietnam has been a center of action, a center of attention. But, it is only a relatively small area in U.S. Pacific command operations that cover 85 million square miles of the earth's surface. To defend the United States against attack through the Pacific Ocean and to support U.S. national policy and interests throughout the Pacific, the Far East and Southeast Asian areas is a mission carrying great responsibility.

It is not an easy mission. No one expects it to be. But it is being done by many men, in many different places. Men on boats, men in planes, men walking on the ground, using a wrench, a rifle, a rope; men, working with their hands, their minds, their hearts.

The United States must maintain strong, modernized, and balanced military forces. Only in this way can we preserve national security as we pursue a quality life for all our people. Only in this way can we continue to guard the ramparts and heritage of a free land and a free people given us by the Nation's founders.

To quote the President in his address to the United Nations general assembly: "Surely, if one lesson above all rings resoundingly among the many shattered hopes in this world, it is that good words are not a substitute for hard deeds and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results."

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of our former colleague from Memphis, Clifford Davis, has truly saddened me.

There are many here today who had the privilege and good fortune to serve with "Mr. Cliff" for many of his 24 years in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately it was my privilege to serve with him only during his last term in the 88th Congress. But during that short time I came to know, respect, and develop a great fondness for him.

The 88th Congress was my first term in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Almost from my first day in the House Mr. Cliff extended his hand of friendship to me. He helped guide me, counsel me, and assist me during those often lonely and confusing freshman days. For this I owe an obligation of gratitude which I can repay now only through the high respect and esteem which I continue to hold for Clifford Davis.

He was an amiable, well-liked, and able legislator. He was my friend and I shall miss him.

An editorial follows:

EX-LAWMAKER CLIFFORD DAVIS, SERVED MEMPHIS 24 YEARS

Clifford Davis, 72, former Democratic member of the House of Representatives from Memphis, Tenn., died yesterday at his home, 4611 Butterworth Pl. NW, after an apparent heart attack.

He had been practicing law here since 1964, when he was defeated in a Democratic pri-

mary in Memphis by George W. Grider. Mr. Davis had served in the House without interruption since 1940.

The former legislator had at least two close brushes with death during his political career.

He was one of five congressmen wounded on March 1, 1954, when members of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party fired pistol shots onto the House floor from the visitors' gallery. He was shot in the right calf and was hospitalized briefly.

Again, on Aug. 6, 1962, Mr. Davis and his wife, Carolyn, narrowly escaped death along with 69 other persons who were aboard an American Airlines plane that crashed as it attempted to land at Knoxville, Tenn., during a violent thunderstorm.

Born in Hazelhurst, Miss., Mr. Davis attended public schools in Memphis and received his law degree at the University of Mississippi.

He served as municipal court judge in Memphis from 1923 to 1927, and as vice mayor and commissioner of public safety to 1940.

A key lieutenant in the powerful Edward H. (Boss) Crump political organization in Memphis, he won a seat in Congress in a special election in 1940.

During his congressional career, he championed a number of causes, including a reduction in time and expenditure for political campaigning.

He was a Baptist, a Mason and Shriner. Survivors include his wife, two sons, Clifford, Jr., of Jarrettsville, Md., and Ray, of Hartford, Conn., and a daughter, Mrs. George Chauncey, of Richmond.

CONCERN ABOUT THE SECOND YEAR ACTION PLAN

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of Washington businessmen are seriously concerned about the second year action plan, and have asked that the following statement be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONCERN ABOUT THE SECOND YEAR ACTION PLAN

My name is Simon Kriger; I am the principal shareholder of S. Kriger, Inc., located at 712-12th Street, N.W., within the proposed Second Year Action Plan. Mr. Nichols and Mr. Bromwell asked that I participate in this presentation to the City Council on behalf of all the Small Businessmen Affected by the Second Year Action Plan. This evening I will address myself only to the common problems we all have, saving for tomorrow afternoon the details of my particular situation.

First, I want to bring clearly to your attention the inequities of the current urban renewal eminent domain provisions as they apply to any person whose property is condemned. While the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution requires that an individual not be deprived of his private property without just compensation, the current law does not make whole a businessman or home-owner whose property is deemed needed for the higher purposes of his community. To a significant extent public improvements, such as the Second Year Action Plan, are financed by individual sacrifices on the part of those unfortunate persons located in the geographic area affected.

The basic standard used for determining "just compensation" is the price which a "willing buyer" and a "willing seller" will

agree upon. However, only by legal fiction is a "willing seller" involved in a condemnation proceeding. Only because he is not willing to sell is an individual's property condemned. In most cases, he is not willing to sell because his property represents to him a far greater value than to an ordinary person—due to its unique service for his particular business, or to the established clientele who know the business because of a long-time geographic identification, or other intangible factors of "good will". None of these considerations are recognized in determining the amount the owner will be paid for his property.

A second uncompensated loss to businessmen dispossessed by an urban renewal plan is the amount of profits sacrificed by the confusion and disruption caused by relocation. Even if a businessman is able to find new quarters close by, packing, moving and unpacking often require months during which business cannot be conducted. This loss is, of course, doubled if a businessman exercises his first option rights to return to the redeveloped area.

In addition, while the current law provides for payment of actual moving expenses (providing a businessman does not move more than 100 miles from his current location) the HUD regulations specifically exclude the costs of fixtures and of any physical alterations required to be made in structures because of the need to relocate. Moving any business requires construction of new facilities—kitchens for restaurants, presses for printers, vaults for art dealers—often requiring many thousands of dollars. Excepting these costs forces a businessman not only to forgo ordinarily anticipated profits, but also to suffer severe out-of-pocket expenditures.

Finally, each businessman is offered the opportunity to move back into the new, modern facilities several years later. This is absurd. First, by that time he makes good in his new location or closes his business. Second, if he returns, the rent alone will be six to ten times more and he would have to start all over to build his business.

If a businessman were to decide himself that expansion of his business, remodeling of his store, or the addition of new equipment would provide sufficient long-term benefits to outweigh the costs and disruptions involved, expenses such as these could be tolerated. However, when a public authority makes the decision that relocation is necessary for the public good, requiring improvements to be subsidized by losses to individual small businessmen is inequitable and unfair.

The losses involved are also intolerable to many small businessmen in the purely economic sense. The Council should recognize that implementation of the present plan under current law will cause many of the businesses affected to close down. The coming of the Metro has already registered one notable casualty—Lowdermilk's bookstore—which provided a unique service to this city for many years. There are many others who must very seriously consider whether it is worth the effort to play the relocation game. Because of the heavy-handed, abrupt and arbitrary manner in which this program has been developed to date and the total lack of meaningful sympathy expressed by public officials for our plight, we can hardly be blamed for anticipating the same treatment in the future in handling our relocation and moving problems.

However, these losses—the losses to businessmen displaced and the losses to the city of unique talents and cultural variety—are not necessary to achieve the goals of the Second Year Action Plan.

The National Capitol Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency ("RLA") wish to maximize the impact of the Metro system as a spur to new development in downtown Washington. They propose to condemn large blocks of land cur-

rently owned and occupied by small businesses in order to assemble them into large parcels suitable for construction of major new buildings by large private developers. Urban renewal is deemed necessary by the RLA.

"To assemble parcels of sufficient size for feasible development by private investors, and to achieve maximum public benefits through design and development."

In answer to the question "Why won't the Metro System be sufficient to bring about private development, without urban renewal?" the RLA answers:

"Metro will provide greater accessibility, and greater potential development opportunities, throughout the Washington Area—not just in Downtown. Further, the Metro System by itself cannot overcome the problems of land assembly and poor environment in the areas surrounding the stations."

The developers of the Second Year Action Plan thus identify three reasons for urban renewal: to concentrate on Downtown, to overcome the problems of poor environment, and to overcome the problems of land assembly. However, the program will provide no long-range benefits with respect to the first two identified reasons and is not necessary to achieve the third. When the properties are finally assembled and leveled, a private developer will still have to choose whether to invest in downtown, on Connecticut Avenue or in the suburbs; only if the assembled properties are sold at less than their true market value could any artificial incentive to construction in Downtown be created. Similarly, the proposed plan will do nothing to provide a better "environment" in the general area. This will arise from construction of the subway, increased public facilities and increased attention to safety of the public streets.

Therefore, the real purpose for the Second Year Action Plan is land assembly. Because the blocks included in the Plan are broken up into small ownership parcels, the city planners have decided that the only way to combine them in groups suitable for construction of larger buildings, which will create more jobs, more taxes and generally increased business activity, is to condemn them all through urban renewal.

This is just not so. In the very short period of one week since the idea was suggested to us by Downtown Progress, owners of at least some of the businesses involved have been able to agree upon terms for joint development of their properties in economically significant parcels. For instance, the businesses along the west side of 12th Street—Altman's Parking Lot (two owners), A & N Trading Co., Inc., S. Kriger, Inc., and D. L. Bromwell, Inc.—have entered into a binding legal agreement jointly to develop or sell their properties, totalling 16,917 square feet, sharing the profits according to the relative square footage that each now owns. We have asked our attorneys to prepare the necessary documents for us to form a corporation to which we plan to transfer title to all the properties. Our example is conclusive proof that land assembly can be accomplished without intervention of the urban renewal plan, without great sacrifice to the businessmen involved, and without their loss to the community at large.

Our assembled properties will now be available for development by us or for purchase and development by private parties whenever the financial climate is such that construction of major new buildings in the area is economically feasible. We have every reason to believe that we will be able to obtain financing comparable to that which any private developer could assemble, given the necessary time. Because we will be master of our own ship and captain of our own fate, we cannot complain when we choose to relocate ourselves, even though in so doing we will not rely on public subsidies.

The major issue before the City Council, and the cry which we businessmen have raised since we heard of the proposal, has been "Why now?" We are not opposed to progress in downtown. We want it as much as Woodward & Lothrop. As I have shown, we are willing to work toward it, and to achieve success where big business and Downtown Progress have failed in the past. We ask only to be given a chance to develop fully our plans, and to see that our needs and ideas are taken into consideration in renewal of Downtown.

In addition to the arbitrary exclusion of small businessmen, their ideas, and their problems during the creation of the Second Year Plan, the proposal before the Council has other deficiencies which can be cured by the mere addition of sufficient time. Most glaring is the lack of any plan for reuse or disposition of the properties to be acquired. The proponents of the plan are able to create dream castles for the future of the area—pavillions, international centers, shopping plazas, huge office buildings—all of these have been mentioned to us—without any concrete proposals tested either by city planning concepts or by economic reality. The City Council, and the affected businessmen, are being asked to make huge financial commitments and undergo severe personal hardships, respectively, without any clear idea of the ultimate result. As a businessman, I would never put the cart before the horse, and would require a clear outline of planned operations before making such an investment. As a responsible public body, the City Council should demand no less.

With a little time the proper mixture of demolition, rehabilitation, and public and private redevelopment can be put together, with a spirit of cooperation, and a mutual devotion to Downtown Washington. Where are you likely to find a group as dedicated to the good of the city and of the Downtown area, as those who have invested and labored here for many years, watching the timid flee at the first signs of difficulty?

There is no reason why the Plan must be rushed to immediate approval. In order to obtain funds in this year's HUD budget, a plan must be submitted this month. However, funds will be available next year, and the next, and the next. The Neighborhood Development Program is designed for yearly increments—well-planned yearly increments. The Downtown plan can be included just as well twelve months from now.

There is no need for approval in order to make construction possible. The Second Year Action Plan does not contemplate the beginning of construction until after the Metro is completed—three or four years from now. Knox Banner, Executive Director of Downtown Progress, has told us that it will be impossible to begin construction until subway work is completed. Surely design and clearing can be completed in two or three years following careful development of a plan for use as well as destruction.

For the same reason there is no net savings to the businesses involved by having renewal parallel subway construction. It will not do so. We look forward to a year to eighteen months of chaos during which G and Twelfth Streets will be planked over. Then, just as business is returning to normal, we will be displaced. Eighteen months later, construction of the new development will begin. Therefore, we do not see the Second Year Action Plan as saving us any worries from the Metro confusion—it will merely extend them.

The valuation of our properties already must include the expectation of the subway. The cost of condemning them, should this same proposal emerge from further planning, will not change substantially during the next year.

To us the only parties who appear likely to benefit from immediate approval of the

Downtown portions of this plan are our big business neighbors who would like nothing better than to have our competition removed for two or three years.

I trust all of the above will be taken into consideration and that you will reach the only rational solution to this problem. A Chinese scholar once told me that it is easy to destroy, but very difficult to create. The plan submitted to the Council this evening contains a great deal of destruction.

A COURAGEOUS COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR SPEAKS OUT

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for too long, too many college campuses have been more like battlegrounds, rather than citadels of learning, culture, and contemplation.

The executive dean of Phoenix College in Phoenix, Ariz., has taken exception to this climate on the campuses and believes that college administrators can do much to rectify the situation. After seeing a statement by the commission on legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Dean P. Lee Thompson, wrote a thoughtful letter of rebuttal. I believe that his viewpoint is one shared by the overwhelming majority of Americans. In the hope that students, faculty, administrators, and taxpayers will reflect on his conclusions and learn the fallacy of violence, I am inserting the letter in the RECORD at this point:

MAY 29, 1970

COMMISSION ON LEGISLATION,
American Association of Junior Colleges,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I have carefully read your statement on the question of protest on the campus. I certainly cannot agree with your conclusions. I do agree with paragraph 1, but I cannot agree with the second part of paragraph 2 in which you conclude that the use of loaded firearms should never be used. Let me justify my position.

The key to dissent and rightful expression of dissent is peaceful. My personal observation tells me that much of the dissent on the college campus is not peaceful. It is not American, it is not in good taste, and it is not in the American tradition of rational, peaceful, persuasive dissent; but rather it is violent, vulgar, disgraceful, challenging and disrespectful of the rights of others. I am convinced that we must maintain law and order and the American principles of control of the violent students and non-student provocateurs or college campuses will continue to require the National Guard, the police and perhaps federal troops. A police force must have the power and authority to enforce its legitimate mission and commands. At Kent State I think, from the reports given, that the "peaceful" students provoked the Guardsmen into using legitimate means of control. I regret that some students lost their lives. Yesterday, at our State University—a short distance from our campus—snipers fired in "peaceful" dissent on the police and citizens, broke windows, fire-bombed cars, passing motorists and innocent bystanders, and last night "peaceful" violence erupted in Phoenix when snipers blasted police cars.

Gentlemen, if this is "peaceful" dissent, as a veteran I do not know the meaning of war and I submit that force must be matched with force and these "peaceful" protesters

must be dealt with firmly, but with compassion and understanding.

For the reasons stated, the examples illustrated, and my own personal observation, I cannot support the commission's statement.

After several years of being humiliated, embarrassed, criticized with disrespect by dissenting students, we have determined on this campus to enforce, if necessary, respect in all our student-faculty relationships by taking appropriate disciplinary action of expulsion of those students who do not wish to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered by this institution. I recognize this takes courage, but I believe college administrators must be courageous; our police must be courageous; all those in key positions must be courageous enough to deal with these violent students.

May I suggest the commission deliberate again on this matter and adopt a realistic statement which can be supported courageously by college administrators.

Sincerely yours,

J. LEE THOMPSON,
Executive Dean.

THE QUESTION OF PROTEST ON THE CAMPUS: A STATEMENT BY THE COMMISSION ON LEGISLATION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

The Commission on Legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges deplores the resort to violence on the nation's campuses. The right of students to peaceful expressions of dissent must be recognized by all—citizens, college authorities and civil authorities. Freedom of expression is a cornerstone of our national democracy. To restrict this right, bowing to the tensions of the times, would do irreparable damage to our nationhood and our national honor.

We urge college authorities to develop effective techniques for accommodating student dissent. Such techniques should provide leadership to channel student dissent into peaceful paths, to keep open avenues of communication between students and college and civil authorities, and to protect the rights of non-dissenting students. "No-exist" confrontations should be avoided; civil authorities should be called in only when necessary; their methods of control should never include the use of loaded firearms. The events at Kent State University and Jackson State College show all too clearly the risks involved.

We urge our national leaders to recognize that dissenting students have deep and legitimate grievances which they are expressing. To castigate the students' behavior without recognizing the causes of that behavior is in itself a provocative approach to the problem. If, on the other hand, the students can be encouraged to feel that their grievances are heard and seriously considered in national policy decisions, their need to resort to demonstrations, with their inherent risk of violence, will abate.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

INFLATION—AN ECONOMIC
MALADJUSTMENT

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Harold W. Fox, professor of marketing at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill., published a paper entitled, "Inflation—An Economic Maladjustment." While space does not permit reprinting the entire paper in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith Professor Fox's summary of his findings:

FACING THE 1970's

From the indications available, it appears that the future course of inflation depends primarily on political decisions, which are outside the purview of economic forecasting. The following economic points seem worth emphasizing:

1. After three decades, of prosperity, business, labor, and the consumer have at their disposal many alternatives that reduce the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policies.

2. The most disastrous course of action, in the opinion of many economists, would be governmental price-wage controls. Whatever the economic consequences, the basic problem of price regulations is political: it is impossible to enforce a law that is frequently violated by a large proportion of the citizenry.

3. Assuming no new war and no major governmental action to escalate the rate of inflation, the immediate, short-term outlook is for a slight recession accompanied by continuing inflation. For one thing, many labor contracts provide for substantial wage increases over the next several years. For another, increasing dependence on nonpostponable labor-intensive services such as medical care, auto repairs, hotel services, and baby-sitting, plus rising financial outlays on interest, insurance, and property taxes give the American economy a strong inflationary base. To this can be added agricultural price supports, oil quotas, obsolete building codes which perpetuate inefficiency in home construction, and other government programs that maintain or raise prices. But, hopefully, the rate of price increase will abate.

4. Over the longer term, it appears that the price system's traditional role as allocator of resources will continue to erode. The present outlook is for greater emphasis on what economists call social overhead. There seems to be an inescapable need for concentration on urban renewal, mass transportation, air purification, water cleansing, and many other collective projects. Insofar as they are essential for human survival, there is no choice but to motivate these social efforts. The challenge is to perform them effectively while preserving America's heritage of individual freedom including occupational options and business incentives.

In principle, the price mechanism could coordinate social undertakings as well as individual pursuits. For example, if each automobile and each bus had to defray the costs of its infringement on the environment, most commuters would have to elect mass transportation.

Only wealthy people could afford the high cost of riding in a separate car. But such an extension of the price system might engender strong sentiment for governmental redistribution of wealth and income.

5. This paper has shown that two variants each of cost-push, demand-pull, and social rigidity interact to erode the purchasing power of the dollar, with little likelihood of

a reversal. The most important influence on the future course of price stability is the will of the citizenry. Output must be increased and infusions of buying power curtailed toward a zone where the supply of most goods and services is in balance with demand at existing prices. If the implications of economic policies are widely understood and if price stability receives vigorous backing, policymakers—mainly in governments, but also in labor unions and corporate directorships—will pursue whatever economic goals the public deems to be in its interest. Cure from the malady of inflation depends on the resolve of the people and the skill of their representatives.

THE MEDIA IS HUMAN

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, each and every day we are reminded that violence has become a part of American life. At one time most Americans felt it was confined to dealings between nations or restricted to States unable to properly govern themselves but the past decade has seen it brought increasingly home. Indeed, few Americans are spared its effects.

In a sense, the increasing level of violence is a reflection of the state of our society today. We are becoming polarized. Reason is being replaced by a lack of thought. There are signs that the solid middle is being eroded by the demagogues of both left and right.

The level of polarization has reached the point where, in a sense, the prophesy of violence becomes self-fulfilling.

We must pursue policies that will quiet the noise, that will lessen the discord, that will heal the wounds. To do so will require more understanding than many have exhibited. It may even require the giving up of momentary gain—political or otherwise.

The instruments that can convey the new sense of purpose are the news media. At the moment they are the subject of considerable criticism and even attack. The reasons for it are many and complex. Part stems from a vague general intuitive feeling that modern communications contribute to the level of violence in America—"Television is a live medium and those who use it go out of their way looking for action."

Another criticism is that the news journalists, particularly those from certain geographical areas, are insulated or calloused to the everyday events of life.

Whatever the validity of the other levels of criticism this is one that, in my judgment, is not justified.

Those in the news media are not insulated from the human problems of our time. Like everyone else the newsmen are members of our society and they, along with the rest of us, have suffered very real problems from the violence that threatens our Nation.

In the real estate section of the Sunday, June 7, 1970, issue of the New York Times, there was an excellent article about the very human problems of the

coproducer of one of the more controversial television news programs today. The article chronicles the problems which befell Mr. Sanford Socolow, coproducer of the Columbia Broadcasting System's network news program "The CBS Evening News," and his family. Just over a year ago, Mr. Socolow was forced by the very real threat of violence into moving his family out of the city, where he had lived all his life, into the suburbs. The cause was not a single riot or demonstration but a series of what some might term "mundane" conflicts among neighbor-tenant-landlord.

As the author of the article notes, the series of incidents "is hardly a typical one—but in a broad sense the Socolow case represents a cross-section of the abrasive, sometimes agonizing Tenant-Landlord Court, but seldom reach public notice."

Although the level of violence in instances of this type is more in threat than in action, it does not detract from its importance as an object lesson. In my judgment, we must find means of resolving all the little problems and conflicts that confront us if we are ever to successfully deal with the larger ones.

I think Mr. Robert Alden's article could be very instructive in showing some of the factors that work to produce the intolerable circumstances outlined. Therefore, I include his article, "Feud on 33d Floor Drives a Family Into Suburban Life," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1970]

FEUD ON 33D FLOOR DRIVES A FAMILY INTO
SUBURBAN LIFE

(By Robert Alden)

It is now a year, almost to the day, that Sanford Socolow, a lifelong resident of the city, his wife and children, moved to the suburbs.

What follows is a case history of a family that wanted to remain in New York but was forced to move, not for the usual reasons, but because of a bad neighbor-tenant-landlord relationship. The case history is hardly a typical one because it involved most unusual circumstances.

But in a broad sense the Socolow case represents a cross-section of the abrasive, sometimes agonizing tenant-landlord relationships that end in Tenant-Landlord Court, but seldom reach public notice. In the last year alone, the Tenant-Landlord Courts of the city handled a staggering load of 358,385 cases.

Normally, such landlord-tenant disputes are so clouded by claim and counterclaim that it becomes impossible to determine where the truth lies. In the Socolow case, in the words of Judge Martin B. Stecher, who heard the case, "the facts are not in serious contention."

In addition, since the Socolow family at one point took refuge in my house out of fear of a neighbor, I was able to get firsthand reports of the succession of bizarre events that transpired.

To set the scene, Mr. Socolow is the coproducer of the Columbia Broadcasting System's network news program, "The CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite." In March, 1967, he moved with his expectant wife and an infant son into a three-bedroom 33d-floor apartment in a new luxury building at 444 East 82d Street.

The owner of the apartment house at that time was Winston-Holzer; the managing agent at that time was Douglas L. Elliman & Co. The monthly rental for the apartment was \$525.

Within a few weeks after the Socolows moved in, a man, identified in the court papers as "K" and later by the police as Herbert Kaye, moved into an apartment opposite the Socolow apartment. Almost immediately the man proved to be an unusual neighbor. In Judge Stecher's words:

"K had parties which were frequent and noisy. His guests were numerous, raucous and persistently on hand.

"What went on at these parties is not clear, but the guests—who paid a fee to attend K's parties—lined up in the corridor several times a week, waiting noisily and impatiently to enter K's apartment. Having done so, they spilled back out into the corridor, using it as part of the K residence, where they drank, fought and caroused."

There were other odd disturbances.

On one occasion, in late August, 1967, the Socolows said they were disturbed "by what sounded like inhuman walls and screams from the corridor outside our door."

"There were heavy bangs and what sounded like fingernails trying to dig into Kaye's door," Mr. Socolow said. "The noise continued for possibly half an hour. Interspersed were hysterical screams—I know you're there, Herbie."

Mr. Socolow said that he opened the door and found a young man down on his knees in front of Kaye's apartment. He asked the man to leave since he was disturbing the sleep of the children (a second child had since been born). The man, who according to Mr. Socolow did not appear intoxicated, refused, saying, "I'll buy your kids." The police were called.

The police dragged the fellow away bodily while he cried and screamed, "Leave me alone. I'm a nice Jewish boy. Leave me alone."

Beginning in September, Mr. Socolow and other tenants in the building had repeated conversations complaining about Kaye—once a week or more—with the district manager for Douglas Elliman in charge of 444 East 82d Street.

The manager repeatedly told Mr. Socolow that he was aware of Kaye and the shenanigans in his apartment, that the police had been informed, and that he was in the process of evicting Kaye.

Inquiries by Mr. Socolow to the 19th Precinct, which has jurisdiction in the area of 82d Street and York Avenue, disclosed no record of any complaint made by Douglas Elliman against Kaye. Month after month went by. The parties continued with the usual noise and attendant excitement. The plot developed.

Judge Stecher, in his account of the case, wrote:

"K in time acquired two companions in residence—a huge dog and an even larger man. Both seemed to serve the same function: to preserve by their size and threatening demeanor K's peace and discipline in the 33-d-floor corridor and apartment."

The large man's efficiency, according to Mr. Socolow, was a match for his size. He roamed the corridor enforcing the order of the queue and assuring complainers that they would soon be admitted to Kaye's apartment to join in the party fun.

The tenants on the 33d floor of the luxury building were cowed.

On the evening of Jan. 20, the Socolows left their apartment to go to a dinner party. Their two children were in the care of a baby-sitter. Soon the teen-aged sitter found herself terrified by the loud and vulgar talk outside, people rattling the front door of the Socolow's apartment and the booming voice of the hefty keeper of the queue. She telephoned her mother.

The Socolows returned to find the perturbed mother and the frightened daughter. When the mother had to shoulder her way by three girls waiting outside the Kaye apartment in order to get to the Socolow

apartment, the large man advised the girls to "ignore that nut."

A couple of hours after the sitter and her mother had left, in the early hours of Jan. 21, there was a sudden outburst of what sounded to Mr. Socolow like a fight in the corridor.

"I jumped from bed," Mr. Socolow said, "opened the door and found that a considerable group of party-goers were in the hallway, again loud and vulgar, obscene and vile."

"I asked the bouncer," Mr. Socolow said, "to take the party back into Kaye's apartment and shut the door to cut down the decibel count. Suddenly Kaye leapt into the corridor and, with a maniacal gesture and look on his face, screamed abuse at me: 'You want quiet, go live in a cemetery. As a matter of fact, if you're looking for trouble, I'll give it to you. I'm going to get you. I'm going to get your family.'"

"At which point," Mr. Socolow said, "the bouncer, announcing in a yell that he was going to beat me up and my family too, advanced on me. I retreated, slammed the door and bolted it. They proceeded to bang on it, putting a slight dent in the steel."

In Judge Stecher's view, "only timely slamming of [Mr. Socolow's] door saved him from serious injury."

The Elliman representative was told immediately of the incident, according to Mr. Socolow, and the representative said that Kaye was being evicted and should be out by the end of the week. By the end of the week Kaye had not been evicted.

The court later determined that, although numerous tenant complaints had been made over a period of at least five months and although the police had been called to the building on several occasions, "no effort was made by the landlord to stop K or evict him from the premises."

It was at this point that this writer came into the picture. I was vacationing in Barbados when I received a telephone call from Mr. Socolow, a journalistic colleague.

He said that he feared for the safety of his family and asked if he could move the family into a spare room in my apartment, which was in another building. At the same time, Mr. Socolow wrote Mr. James J. McSherry, a district manager of Douglas Elliman:

"Because of the vile and obscene occurrences in the 33d floor corridor of 444 East 82d Street, I have moved my family from apartment 33A. I have abandoned the apartment—I hope, temporarily—because of the threat of physical harm to me and my family."

In the words of Judge Stecher:

"Their [the Socolows'] fears were justified. One evening [Feb. 15, 1968] after their departure, the Socolow's front door was vigorously assaulted by an unknown person wielding an ax," Judge Stecher said.

The ax attack accomplished what the remonstrations of the tenants and their offers to bear witness against Kaye had failed to accomplish. With the permission of the absent Socolow family, Douglas Elliman, on Feb. 16, stationed an armed guard in the 33d-floor Socolow apartment.

Early in the morning of Feb. 19, someone using a flammable liquid set fire to the Socolow door and the abutting walls and floor.

Kaye has since been indicted on an arson charge in connection with this incident.

As soon as the fire was extinguished, the guard called the police and, while they were investigating the case, in a second incident, the police said that Kaye assaulted a policeman inside the Socolow apartment. Kaye was arrested and has since pleaded guilty to the charge of fighting with a policeman. He will be sentenced on that charge in Manhattan Criminal Court tomorrow.

A few nights after the fighting incident,

Kaye, out on bail, was roaming the 33d floor corridor rifle in hand. He was forcibly disarmed by the private guard.

The Socolow family, staying in my apartment, made occasional trips to their apartment, at 444 East 82d Street in the company of a guard provided by Douglas Elliman to get needed articles of clothing.

As I was a personal witness, I know that they were thoroughly shaken by their brush with Kaye. Mrs. Socolow burst into tears on several occasions, not only because of the nature of the experience, but also because she had been uprooted from her home with a newborn child and young son.

The Socolows removed all of their personal possessions from 444 East 82d Street on Feb. 28.

"I felt that my first obligation was to see to the safety of my family," Mr. Socolow said. "We could not remain there. My basic complaint was that, although we had offered time and time again—as did other tenants in the building—to bear witness against Kaye, Douglas Elliman and the landlord did nothing about evicting him. We suspected that we were subject to corporate lying about so-called eviction efforts and the subsequent findings of the court proved that our suspicions were justified."

"But what is even more appalling is that if we tenants in a luxury building paying sky-high rents were not able to get relief from a fellow tenant who was making our lives miserable, how much more difficult it must be for tenants in the less affluent areas of the city to enjoy the peace and quiet that their lease entitles them to have."

John F. Hamlin, chairman of Douglas Elliman, refused to comment publicly on Judge Stecher's findings or on any aspect of the case.

Judge Stecher wrote in his decision that "to the end of February, the landlord made no effort to evict K or otherwise inhibit him." It was only in March, after the Socolows removed all their personal possessions, that the landlord brought a summary proceeding against Kaye and had him evicted.

The Socolows' fears in the case of Kaye were well-grounded. In addition to the assault on the policeman and the charge against him for setting fire to the Socolow door, it turned out that Kaye was wanted on a fugitive warrant on a charge of arson in Pennsylvania, accused of burning down a motel in Bucks County.

As for Kaye's large companion, the police reported that he has a record of 22 arrests, including charges of burglary and rape.

Shaken by their experience, the Socolows moved temporarily from my house to another apartment in the city while they searched for the suburban home where they now live.

"We moved to the suburbs," Mr. Socolow said, "because my wife and I were so disturbed by what could and did happen to us. If we felt we could not be safe, I did not want to live there. We hated to leave the city. But my wife never recovered from the fright. I felt that there was nothing else for us to do."

A LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a constituent who is serving in Vietnam which I would like to share with my colleagues. Sp4c. Louis

J. Brooks, born and raised in my hometown of Pitman, N.J., is serving with the Army's 25th Division and writes of his impression of American troop action in Cambodia as well as his observation of attitudes generally:

I thought you might like to know the general attitude over here toward the push into Cambodia, and the student riots on the college campuses. I have yet to hear one negative opinion toward Nixon's decision to go into Cambodia. It is evident to everyone over here that these enemy sanctuaries had to be destroyed. . . . It was factual that as long as these camps (North Vietnamese Army base camps) were allowed to exist, this region of South Vietnam would never be totally secure.

I would observe that not only was the region around Saigon constantly threatened so long as the enemy could mount attacks from its base camps in Cambodia with relative impunity, but the capacity to mount these attacks has a direct relation to the safety of our own troops operating within the range of the base camps.

Specialist Brooks continues:

After our withdrawal (from Cambodia), I can see our area becoming so inactive with enemy activity that the Arvn's (South Vietnamese Army) could take over the whole battle. I mean either a total withdrawal of U.S. troops, or at least a withdrawal of the infantrymen.

Certainly, this is a very important factor in the President's policy, for to enable the success of the Vietnamization program is to insure the continued withdrawal of American combat troops.

While convinced that the President's decision was right under the circumstances, Specialist Brooks then turns his attention to troop reaction to antiwar demonstrations here at home:

Most of my friends cannot understand the big protest at home, since there is none here. I feel our news media have created much of the trouble. . . . Our soldiers are treated better here than in any other war. The morale here is very high. The biggest morale problem is homesickness. . . . If the college students understood Nixon's decision like I do, I don't think the deaths at Kent State would have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the almost fanatical idealism of the militants heading the antiwar protests is totally inconsistent with the idealism of those who are engaged in the combat zone of Vietnam. It seems that in the case of the former there is the nebulous intellectual form of idealism while in the latter, represented by those like Specialist Brooks, there is the very real and tangible struggle to enable the people of an entire Nation to exercise the most cherished individual liberty—the right to choose their own destiny. This, in my view, is the most valued idealism.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR AUTOMOBILE BUMPERS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the toll of life, limb, and property lost each year

CXVI—1217—Part 14

in high-speed automobile accidents is incredible and we have all been made keenly aware of it, and are doing what we can to correct it. But it is a relatively little known fact that thousands of persons are injured and billions of dollars are lost each year as a result of low-speed automobile accidents.

The human suffering and inconvenience is staggering, and the enormous economic cost is passed along to the consumer in the nature of large repair bills, higher insurance premiums, and decreased life expectancy of the vehicle. In addition, these accidents constitute a heavy strain on the automotive repair business, on our court system, on our police agencies, and on the scarce materials used in making necessary repairs.

Two recent studies conducted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety point out the delicacy of the automobile's external structure and the magnitude of the costs associated with low-speed collisions. Tests performed on four 1969 sedans—Chevrolet Impala, Ford Galaxie, Plymouth Fury I, and Ambassador SST—demonstrated that on the average, they sustained approximately \$200 in damage when driven forward into a barrier at 5 miles per hour—equal to a fast walk; \$650 in the same situation at 10 miles per hour—jogging speed; and \$500 to both automobiles when driven into the rear of an identical vehicle at 10 miles per hour.

Tests on four 1970 small and less expensive cars—Volkswagen, Toyota Corona, Ford Maverick, and American Hornet—demonstrated the following damage in the same circumstances: \$150 at 5 miles per hour into a barrier; \$400 at 10 miles per hour into a barrier; and \$400 at 10 miles per hour into another car. Frankly, there is just no legitimate reason why automobile bumpers should crumple at such low speeds.

The automobile industry presently makes a bumper that can withstand an impact of only 2.8 miles per hour. Dr. William Haddon, Jr., president of the Insurance Institute, stated in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee that—

Current automobile exterior designs, while aimed at the eye of the consumer in the showroom, are pointed directly at his wallet on the road.

The technology presently exists to produce a resistant bumper; it is merely a question of applying the available engineering skills to the task. One company has already reported the successful testing of a new bumper, safe to vehicle and passengers at speeds up to 30 miles per hour.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, I am now pleased to introduce a bill to require motor vehicle safety standards relating to the ability of the vehicle to withstand certain collisions. My bill would amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. It requires the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe motor vehicle safety standards to insure that motor vehicles manufactured after January 1, 1972, will be able to withstand a collision—either front or rear—with an immovable object at speeds up to and including 10 miles per

hour without sustaining property damage or injury to the occupants of such vehicle.

I hope this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring it. I believe it can go a long way toward reducing the tremendous claim low-speed collisions make on us all.

"IT'S UP TO YOU"—A COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY MR. BARING OF NEVADA BEFORE NEVADA HIGH SCHOOLS, 1970

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BARING, Mr. Speaker, Graduation Day, 1970, around the United States, and especially in Nevada, coincided with thoughts I had regarding the seemingly unending and unwarranted disruptions on American college campuses.

As many of the students graduating from high school at the first of this month plan to go on to college, I felt it necessary to address the graduates on the basis of what these students, who will be freshmen on the campuses next fall, can do to insure that their higher education process is not interrupted by misguided and unthinking students who have the only desire, apparently, to cause unrest on campus and do not have the keen desire to complete their studies during the academic year or allow others to do so.

The students who desire to bring about changes in our system of government, and college administration policy for that matter, have the right to disagree. But they only have that right, and I will emphasize that they are only right, when they go about it in a peaceable and constructive manner.

The anarchistic movements on some of the campuses by some of the students has caused, I believe, alarm not only in the minds of the parents of all potential college-age students.

Many adult Americans today have, what I will term, a "bad taste in their mouth" regarding college students because of a few students who disrupt campus life, destroy property, and put the rights of all students in jeopardy.

This situation I want to help correct.

With this in mind, I prepared and delivered the following speech to two high schools at graduation this June 1970, with the hope that they would be sure to find the best path through their coming college life:

IT IS UP TO YOU

Being the commencement speaker here today reminds me of my own high school days. I am particularly reminded of Congressman James Scrugham who was asked on numerous occasions to be the guest speaker in high schools across the State. Congressman Scrugham went on later to become Senator Scrugham, serving the State of Nevada in the U.S. Senate. I had great admiration for this man who had a marvelous knowledge of every aspect of Nevada's economy, but he had an exceptional, extensive and first-hand knowledge of mining in this State. I can well

recall that no matter what the occasion, or no matter what the announced subject of his speech happened to be—it always ended up being a talk concerning gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, manganese and cinnebar.

Well, although I have always been a champion of mining during the years I have served Nevada in the United States Congress, I am not going to speak to you today on the subject of mining. Because you are a youthful audience, I intend to speak to you on a subject of importance to youth. Now, I ask you, what could be more interesting to young people, than the subject of youth, itself?

A number of years ago, a poll was taken among a number of young people, and when the questionnaires were tabulated, it was found that the two things that young people wanted most of all were:

1. To get along with people, and to have more friends, and
2. To find their right and true place in life.

I believe that if a poll were taken today, the questions would be answered just about the same. Of course, the war has altered and influenced the thinking of young people to a considerable extent, because this is something that interferes with the course of normal living. I wish to God that the war were ended, and that every last one of our fighting men were home! I further wish that all wars would cease, and that no one would ever have to go to war again! However, our country is engaged in war, and I believe that either we should win the war, or we should get out! I cannot see the continuation of a war which is getting us nowhere, and which could go on and on indefinitely.

This does not mean that I condone in any way the draft card burners or the American flag destroyers. We have a wonderful country—the best in the world—and the American flag is a symbol of all of the good things which our country represents. Naturally, there are things which need correction within our governmental structure. There are abuses within our governmental system, just as there are abuses within the social system. However, it is not the systems which should be destroyed, but rather the injustices and the wrongs which should be corrected and eliminated. People and their wrong actions must be changed, and they can be changed, through education. Riots, rebellion and destruction are not the ways to go about making the desired changes. To engage in draft card burning, American flag defacement, riots, demonstrations and senseless destruction of buildings—such as we have seen across our nation—is despicable and it is certainly not American. It is downright anarchy! If changes are needed, our forefathers provided us with a constitution which can be amended. This is the orderly American way!

It is gratifying, generally speaking, that our Nevada schools and colleges have not gone along with that deplorable type of behaviour. In fact, recently the students at the University of Nevada in Reno paid an approving tribute to the university president and his wife, by giving them an all-expenses-paid-trip to California. This was certainly a "switch" from what we have witnessed in colleges across the country.

There has been a very unhealthy trend of thought spreading among many of the youth of this country, and I would like to bring a word of warning to you at this time. There are subversive forces and underground movements which have been for some time (and still are active) engaging in polluting the minds of our young people! They have impressed the minds of our youth with the idea that they should not believe or have confidence in people who are older than thirty years of age. They have attempted to turn the minds of the youth of this country against their parents. They have exagger-

ated and blown up out of all proportion the so-called "generation gap." They have tried to create a great breach between the younger and the older generations.

Unfortunately, many young people—misled and misguided—have become the victims of poisonous influences. They have not stopped to consider that the very leaders in these subversive movements are persons who are way past their thirties!

I have two very good examples to illustrate this point I am making. There is a certain past-middle-aged, silver-haired woman who is a leader in the so-called "New Morality" movement, who publicly has told young people that there is no longer any need for the ten commandments. This is a deliberate attempt to break down the necessity of law and order—and it comes from a person long past thirty.

Another example is a man who was one of the leaders in a recent "march" upon the Federal Building in Reno. His youthful followers who carried signs upon which were painted the symbol of the clenched fist, apparently did not notice that this anarchist was a man between forty and fifty years of age! Yet, these very same agitators will attempt to tell the youth of our country not to listen to their parents, and not to believe in or trust anyone over thirty years of age!

We are living in times which require a great deal of perception and awareness because there are forces at work which are bent on destroying our country and the very systems which made America a great nation. By using clever plays upon words and diabolical subterfuge, they have made great inroads upon the youth of our country. Twisted thinking has influenced the minds of the youth on many campuses, who have fallen victims to this false propaganda. It is important for us to remember that if government and social changes are necessary, there are sane and orderly ways and means of bringing about these changes. These ways and means are not found in revolution, vandalism, pillaging and looting. It was a pitiful sight in Washington, D.C. not long ago, to see about one fourth of the city go up in smoke, while youthful "hoodlums" looted burning stores, defying law and order, as they carried away radios, television sets and all manner of other furniture.

The fact of the matter is that there will always be a need for the ten commandments. (Without law and order this world would be an utter chaos.) The ten commandments are a basic code for human behavior designed to serve for all time.

Therefore, there is no such thing as a "new" morality. One of the Ten Commandments is honour thy father and thy mother, and this is just exactly what this modern, or "mod" morality would not have young people do.

I do not need to tell you that riots, strikes, unkempt young people in dirty clothing, filthy movies, obscene pictures and pornographic literature have become commonplace in our society. The youth of our country represent the most valuable possession that we have. This is why our young people have become the collective target of the enemy forces at work within our country. Drug abuse—the use of drugs among many young people—is the most vicious, depraved and diabolical plot of all. There was a time when decency and morality constituted the acceptable way of life in America, and this was considered to be proper, even if it was not always practiced. Degeneracy was the exception, and it was generally shunned! Today, however, things that used to be looked upon with abhorrence are looked upon lightly, and even advocated! There was a time, also, when criminals were considered enemies of society. Because they had broken the law, they were believed to be deserving of punishment. Today, soft-headed psychologists tell us that acts of

stealing, murder and sexual crimes are merely the product of body chemistry or unfortunate environmental conditions. They further contend that the criminals who commit the atrocities are not to be blamed for their crimes. Only too often thieves and hoodlums are referred to merely as underprivileged people, although many of them have had material and social advantages far beyond any possessed by their forefathers. In the big cities, young men wielding switchblade knives and bicycle chains are defended as innocent victims of our "cruel" society. The result of all of this distorted thinking has been a breakdown of law and order, and an utter disrespect for the law. Our country has seen a spiraling crime rate, and a wave of permissiveness and immorality.

As I mentioned before, the goal of the enemy is the break-down of the morality of our youth. Atheistic forces have succeeded in eliminating prayer from our schools. Now, they are intent upon removing all forms of worship and sacred observances from our public and national life! They want to discontinue showing any religious films on television. So concentrated have these atheistic forces been, in their efforts, that a large segment of our society has abandoned God. This is a far cry from the worshipful attitude of our forefathers, who founded our Nation upon the principles of God. Today the denial of God's very existence is not unusual. I am sure that many of you have heard of the idiotic statement, "God is dead." Those who adhere to this atheistic claim have no conception as to what life actually is. God is life. Therefore, God is the very opposite of death. How could life be death? There is a song being sung lately which says, "If God is dead, what is this that lives within my heart."

Actually, it is the widespread turning away from God that caused the abandonment of morality, and the decay of human conduct. A person who believes that God does not exist, possibly might not possess definite principles for the regulation of human conduct. As a result, such a person would have to work out his own moral system. Murder, stealing, and other crimes would not necessarily be wrong to him. The criteria for right and wrong, for him, would be relative—and not based upon absolute standards laid down by God. Again, I say that there must be a general return to the ten commandments, if this country and this world are to survive and to overcome the present world dilemma! As a Christian, I say that the unbelieving world must be looked upon not with condemnation, but rather with an attitude of compassion. Even though there is often a tendency to ridicule the "hippies," the pornographic writers, the abstract artists and the wild, drug-addicted musicians, they should be prayed for very earnestly, instead. Somehow the fact must be communicated to them, and to all unbelievers, that God does exist, that he does reveal himself, and that he can be known!

In you, young people, lies the hope of the world. With concern and compassion and understanding, you have the power to re-make the world. It is certainly evident that many changes must be made, but they must come about in the right way! The right and proper way is not the way of violence, or rioting, or destruction. In order to change the old, we have to possess something better to offer. We cannot tear down just for the sake of tearing down. We cannot tear down the "establishment" or any other time-honored thing, just for the sake of destruction. We must exercise wisdom and understanding, and we must be sure that we have something better—something that will benefit mankind—before we lend ourselves to movements devoted to change.

Finally, although the present world condition seems disturbed and confused, it is a

good thing to remember that there is always a way out—if we are in tune with the God who lives in us. This is not a meaningless platitude, nor is it a matter of "wishful thinking." It is a truth that each and every one of us gathered here together has one thing in common. This is the fact that we are alive! If we were to say that we are not alive, we would have to resort to telling a falsehood. Therefore, we have a truth—an undisputable fact—about which there can be no doubt—and upon which we can begin to build our lives. The next important step in our self-discovery is the realization that this life, which is the source of our existence, is something greater than our human identity. Without this life which animates us, our bodies would be reduced to nothingness in a very short time.

When we learn that life is God, and when we see that God lives within us, we have discovered the secret that will lead us into personal freedom. Socrates said, "man, know thyself." When we become acquainted with this super self which gives life to our bodies, we will begin to look upon the world in an altogether different manner. We will see how futile it is to try to change things from a human standpoint. We have heard the statement, "as long as there are human beings, there will always be wars." Well, I have news for you. In reality, we are not human beings! The life that lives in you and me is not human. It is the very life of God—which makes us divine beings, or spiritual beings. We are not "human" beings, at all!

Within each and every one of you young people here today, there is a genius locked up inside of you, just waiting to be recognized and set free! God has placed his spirit within you, and you are here on this earth to accomplish a particular purpose! Jesus of Nazareth announced, "the kingdom of God is within you." Listen to the "still small voice" which speaks within your heart. Herein you will have the guidelines for a meaningful and successful life—with plenty of friends! Remember, each of you is a genius in your own particular way. Go forth in good courage, because you are needed! The world is waiting for you to contribute something fine.

GEORGE SEUFFERT AND A NEW YORK CITY BAND

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a most interesting and worthwhile project now in the planning stage in New York City. The project is being shaped by Mr. George Seuffert, of Douglaston, N.Y., and if he is successful, New York City will soon have an official band.

George Seuffert has already planned a series of free concerts to be held on the steps of city hall this summer and he has also interested Mayor John Lindsay in the idea of an official band to play at schools, hospitals, and at ceremonies for visiting dignitaries. Anyone who knows George Seuffert knows that he will probably be successful in making his plan a reality. I have known George and his talented family for a number of years and I am one of those who believes in his plan for our city.

The proposal which George Seuffert is urging on city officials has particular meaning for our young people and as

George explains it, his musical plans seem to be geared toward improving our communication with youth. The story of George's plan was recently told in an article in the May 25 edition of the Long Island Press and I place the text of that article in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues may read this fascinating story:

MUSIC CONSULTANT LOOKS TOWARD CITY'S OWN BAND

(By David Glauberman)

Into his fifth decade as a legendary band conductor, George Seuffert of Douglaston is not about to slow down.

On the contrary, the 57-year-old director of The Seuffert Band is looking forward to heading up the official New York City Band—if and when the band is formed.

Seuffert (as in "toy fort") himself is optimistic that there will in fact be a commercially-sponsored city band "before the end of the second Lindsay Administration."

Mayor Lindsay has been encouraging the idea. Seuffert told The Press in a recent City Hall interview, and as Lindsay's \$1-a-year music consultant Seuffert expects that he would be handed the official baton.

"A band can be employed in the summer giving free concerts and throughout the year working at schools, hospitals—the whole bit," said Seuffert, as well as musically greeting visiting dignitaries, he added.

The city formerly maintained several departmental bands, but they were all cut for economy purposes in the last decade.

"It's my hope that it will be at no cost to the city," said Seuffert. "Let's look at it from this point of view. The finest professional band in this city would cost about \$500,000. . . . It would have to be a cooperative venture."

As conductor of The Seuffert Band, which he inherited from his father in 1929, the crew-cut Ridgewood-born musician has had a wealth of experience in trying to lure dollars from local businessmen.

"I was the first individual to interest commercial concerns in sponsoring free concerts in the city," recalled Seuffert. "It goes back to the days of the Depression when, music being a luxury, it went right out of the window. I went to Grandview Dairy and sold them the idea. They were amenable provided I came up with a gimmick to tie it in with their product."

With that, Seuffert opened his wallet for a reporter and revealed an aging ticket dated June, 1933, that was shaped like a milk bottle cap and proclaimed the sponsor's name on one side and "admit one" on the other.

Even today, despite his band's reputation, Seuffert still finds that he must "keep plugging all the time" to get firms to subsidize the conductor and his men, who may range in number from 25 at an Aqueduct race track concert to 48 at one of his weekly summer concerts in Forest Park.

Frequently appearing with his band is a solo trumpeter billed professionally as Leona May Smith, who also has been billed for 37 years as Mrs. George Seuffert. The couple has four sons—an anesthesiologist in Anchorage, Alaska, who plays piano; a senior at Fordham who serves as a percussionist in his father's band, and two students at Xavier High School in Manhattan, one a trumpeter who received free music lessons from an expert, the other a clarinetist and bassonist. It's what might be called a musical family.

A former music teacher at Bushwick High School and Grover Cleveland High School (where he was department chairman at his retirement in 1967, Seuffert is preparing for a series of free summer concerts to be given periodically on the steps of City Hall.

"There'll be a tremendous variety," he said, "ranging from the Young Saints of Harlem

to high school bands. We also plan a salute to youth program here, featuring the All-City High School Band, the All-City High School Orchestra, and the All-City High School Chorus, to emphasize the constructive and artistic facets of our school system."

In a personal salute to youth, the veteran conductor—whose band plays Tchaikovsky, Richard Rodgers, John Phillips Sousa and Giacomo Puccini at its concerts—said he likes a great deal of rock music.

"I don't divide music into popular and classical and so on," Seuffert said. "It's either good or poor. A great deal of contemporary music is good—groups like the Association. Possibly through this medium our youngsters will discover that there are composers like Bach."

MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE BY LT. COL. R. P. DUNWELL

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day 1970 was marred by a few dissident elements who are too young to appreciate or heed the significance of the sacrifices of the millions of American servicemen throughout our proud history so that the individual liberties and freedoms which we have inherited and would protect with our lives might be passed on, undiminished, to future generations. The right to dissent is clearly among those individual liberties, but I note with dismay that many localities and military installations cancelled Memorial Day ceremonies and services because of threatened demonstrations and the fear of violence.

However, messages were delivered to millions of concerned Americans who solemnly observed Memorial Day services and were no doubt inspired of the imperative need to dedicate ourselves ever so much more sincerely to preserving a way of life which no other nation in the history of the world has so long enjoyed. Such a message was prepared and delivered by Lt. Col. R. P. Dunwell at Memorial Day Services in Berryville, Va. Colonel Dunwell is the assistant to the legislative assistant to the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps and I am pleased to have the opportunity to preserve his timely and inspiring words in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH OF LT. COL. R. P. DUNWELL, MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES

It is a great privilege for me to participate in Memorial Day Services here at Berryville. I am honored to stand in the company of those who rest beneath these grassy slopes.

When this day began to be observed, it was only a day set apart for decorating the graves of those who perished in the Civil War. Year by year it has grown in meaning and in scope until it has come to be the all souls day of the Nation. It now aims to guard and keep alive the memory of all who at any time or in any place, have laid down their lives for this great Nation. To all who by their death have magnified her, to all her servants who have departed this life in her faith, this time is consecrated. There is none so long dead as to be out of mind. There is none so humble as to be overlooked. There is none so mighty or re-

nown as not to receive an added dignity and grace from the spirit of the hour.

Today we recall not only those who wore our Nation's colors in camp and field, but all who gave up health or friends or quiet hours for their country. All who were ready to forego the rewards of office, even the goodwill of their fellow men, not because they loved these less but because they loved our country more.

Is the love of this great land and all she stands for, so encompassing, so consuming, as to be worth the sacrifice of life itself? We look around us, and there is our answer . . . those markers and those white crosses. How many mothers and fathers view those humble markers and think "here is all I loved and hoped for, my hope for the future, my light in a dark world?" How many remember, as I do, that terrible loneliness . . . the silence . . . surrounding the return home of a beloved friend killed in combat? They know . . . those who return and those who do not . . . just why it is they must risk all, even life itself, to preserve for all times a belief, an ideal, a principle. They know and they don't want any one to forget.

We are indeed a privileged people. But as President Eisenhower said in his second inaugural address, "A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both."

These graves and others throughout the world attest to the fact that America and Americans have placed principle above privilege.

There is rampant in our country today, a sinister force of unbelief. A force committed fanatically to the disruption of our society, to the destruction of our traditional way of life, and to the breaking and smashing of authority wherever it may be found. A force that takes advantage of freedom's privilege to flaunt our enemies' flag while they burn and desecrate our flag . . . the flag these men died for. A force which burns and loots in the name of peace. A force that uses American freedom to destroy those freedoms. This force believes that if they are noisy and destructive enough, we the American people, will give in . . . will accept defeat. In this belief they have made the same mistake that so many of our enemies of the past have made. They have underestimated us. They have underestimated our resolve, our determination, our courage to maintain the principles of freedom.

The survival of freedom demands knowledge and understanding based on courage, conviction and deep faith. It demands a patience and sacrifice strong enough to outlast and overcome the forces which seek to limit or destroy freedom. Let our enemies take notice, freedom will survive . . . for America is strong in heart, strong in spirit, and strong in vigilance.

Freedom is a right endowed by our Creator on all men. It is not exclusive. Yet some have never known it, some have had it taken from them by force or simply lost it through complacency; some received it by being born in the right place at the right time; some have fought for it, some . . . many . . . have died for it. Freedom dies when men will not live for it and will not exert themselves in its defense. John Stuart Mill said almost a century ago:

"War is an ugly thing but not the ugliest thing. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing is worth a war is worse. A man who has nothing which he cares about more than his personal safety is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

We the living have a duty . . . assigned to us by those we are honoring today. A duty to know about America's ideals and principles, and how they were developed through the years past. Thus, we re-affirm within our

hearts and lives that statement of principle summed up in those few short lines of the preamble to the Constitution.

" . . . To form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessing of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

We, the people, must strive for excellence in order "to form a more perfect union." We the people must work for justice while ensuring domestic tranquility. These qualities must go hand in hand. They are of particular worth in our Nation today.

"Provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare." The values we cherish as Americans will not survive without the continuing, constant attention of every citizen, involving himself physically, economically, and spiritually in his Nation's welfare.

"And secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Let us have an individual awareness of freedom, liberty, the rights of man. Every free man—at work, at home, in public, and in the secret places of his heart . . . must be ready to preserve our heritage of freedom.

Since the days of our Founding Fathers, many have given their lives so that this experiment in freedom, called democracy, might survive. The men who founded this Nation knew that in their world, a free society would have to prove that it was capable and worthy of survival. Today, we face the same test of our moral values and our convictions.

You, who have lost someone in our Nation's service, can painfully appreciate at what great cost our Nation's heritage has been passed on to us. It is among people like you, communities such as this, that the torch of freedom so valiantly purchased must be passed on. It is here that the fundamental moral and spiritual strength of our people resides. We have shared much as a people. These dead whom we honor here today represent our ties with one another . . . through them we share an inspiration, a bond with the past, a hope for the future.

Those here today . . . and all Americans throughout this country . . . must work with resolve and resourcefulness to find solutions to problems which are a part of this great country in which we live.

The years ahead will be difficult. Our Nation is facing many complex problems, both here at home and overseas. I am confident that if we all work together we can perpetuate that which has, thus far, been achieved at great sacrifice. We have the example of these men . . . the inner resources of their spirit . . . To honor them, we must sacrifice . . . sacrifice some of our wealth and some of our leisure and dedicate them to the purposes for which these men gave their lives. It has been well said that "the price of freedom is eternal vigilance."

Eternity is a long time. But time moves more slowly where there is not freedom.

THE UNION SHOP AND POSTAL REFORM

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

MR. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Columnist David Lawrence has explored the issue of compulsory unionism in the postal reform bill from an angle not generally recognized in the current debate over this provision. I feel that all of my colleagues who are taking a serious look at the implications of this particular provision will

find Mr. Lawrence's column, "The Union Shop and Postal Reform," as it appeared in the June 9 edition of the Washington Evening Star, of special interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to his observations. The column follows:

THE "UNION SHOP" AND POSTAL REFORM (By David Lawrence)

One of the strangest phases of modern democracy is the belief that "liberals" always defend freedom of speech and freedom of individual thought. Presumably the last proposal in the world to receive their approval would be any form of coercion—such as, for instance, compelling a citizen to belong to a particular political party or a national organization claiming to represent any group of citizens.

Yet the "liberals" are strangely silent over the section of the postal reform bill now pending in Congress that would permit labor unions to negotiate for a "union shop," which means that employees may retain their jobs only if they join a union.

The idea that a government employee could lose employment because he or she refuses to become a member of or pay dues to a private organization would seem to be the kind of thing one would expect under a fascist system—certainly not under a democracy.

The postmaster general, who agreed to the new plan, evidently did so because of a desire to settle the recent postal strike and to obtain support for the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The AFL-CIO, while helping to end the dispute, apparently saw an opportunity to get a "union shop" for postal workers as a step toward compulsory unionization for federal employees generally.

The union leaders are already saying that, if they get the scheme into operation in the postal service, with its 750,000 workers, they will endeavor to obtain the same arrangement for all civilian workers in the federal government. There is an intimation that they will seek to extend it to state, county and city governments.

Nineteen states prohibit any interference with the "right to work," but forced unionism could be imposed on public employees in the other 31 states.

In the executive order President Kennedy issued in 1962 authorizing for the first time the unionization of federal employees, compulsory unionism was specifically prohibited.

This was reaffirmed by President Nixon in his executive order covering labor-management relations in the federal service, effective Jan. 1, 1970. It expressly gives each employee "the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join, and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right."

The new legislation would withdraw that protection so far as postal workers are concerned.

Compulsory unionization has long been a matter of controversy in America, and it would be logical to assume that the "liberals" would be the first to denounce any effort to penalize a federal employee who refuses to be forced to join a union. But they have very rarely spoken out against such coercion even in non-public employment. Possibly this is because they have been friendly to the cause of labor in a general sense.

If, of course, the delivery of the mails is turned over to a private organization and the government has no power over it except to contract for service, such a corporation could deal with unions that insist on a "union shop." But there is no sign as yet that the government will completely detach itself from whatever project is set up to handle the mail service. The Washington Daily News said the other day in an editorial:

"The Post Office is a public service, and

even under the reform bill would be financed in part by taxes. It ought not be subject to rule, directly or indirectly, by union politicians.

"Government service should be open to any citizen who wishes to work for the government, who is needed and who can qualify for the job, whether or not he belongs to a union."

In these days of spectacular controversy and debate on public issues, much emphasis is placed on "repression" as an undemocratic attitude toward the rights of a free people. But somehow the compulsion involved in requiring a worker to join a union as the price of keeping a job in the government itself seems to have been completely neglected by the intellectuals as well as by all activists supposedly interested in the cause of true freedom for the individual in America.

There are no signs of any picket lines or "demonstrations" to protest against compulsory membership in a labor organization. Perhaps "conservatives" who oppose such coercion won this label because they believe in "conserving" individual rights.

WHY THE CURRENT NATIONAL CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Richard T. Hanna, recently delivered a speech before the Chiropractors Association of Orange County, Calif., entitled "Why the Current National Crisis in Confidence."

I would like to take this opportunity to share with the House Mr. Hanna's most perceptive analysis of the current national crisis, and I offer the text of his speech for insertion into the RECORD:

WHY THE CURRENT NATIONAL CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

I doubt if anyone in public life could have honestly foreseen the reaction unleashed immediately after the President's announcement to send American troops into Cambodia. Certainly the Vietnam policy has been causing increasing uncertainty, tension, and frustration. There has been a simmering constitutional crisis since the Tonkin Gulf resolution. And there has been continuing erosion in confidence in the government's ability to deal with a wide range of issues ranging from Vietnam to the economy to the environment.

Underneath the surface of the visible issues there grows a distrust of the political process. Americans are feeling more and more that we are in a state of drift. No one seems to be able to say, this is where we are and there is where we want to go. Our sense of national purpose and image, once so strongly understood and regarded, has eroded into uncertainty and a lack of confidence in ourselves and in our leadership.

The President's decision on Cambodia has brought our national identity crisis to the peak. Cambodia has become the focus of these more fundamental and serious concerns. And these concerns must be put into perspective before we can rationally deal with them.

During the past few months and especially within the past few weeks, I have been trying to understand the context of the swiftly moving events. I have been honestly trying to answer the question, where are we, as a people, and why? In answering this most fundamental question, I've come to the

conclusion that the crisis in our national image centers around a confused understanding of the components of our power, how that power has been utilized throughout our history, and how the exercise of our various power components have changed their relationships to one another and between our political institutions, specifically the President and the Congress.

It seems to me that there are three basic elements to our power. First there is the intangible moral power that has emanated from our democratic institutions—tolerance for opposing points of view, the ability to accommodate, and our spirit of pragmatism. This type of power is difficult to put a finger on, but, when you examine our early history, you realize that these intangible, but real assets made quite an impact. In a world that was monarchist and authoritarian, our democracy, as an example and an alternative, served as a tremendous moral power. This type of power set our tone and direction. There was little doubt as to who we were and what role we had to play. We had to demonstrate that a society with our institutions could be successful, could grow, and prosper. Our history has dramatically demonstrated the wisdom of the men who created our institutions.

The Civil War severely tested the power of our political institutions, but those institutions remained stable and were the principle underpinning of our national power.

It is interesting to note that most of our efforts abroad, from our earliest to our most recent involvements, have been, at least in our justification, based either on preserving or promoting our moral concepts. In our early history our moral power was sufficient to promote our causes. For a long time it was really the only important base of our power. During those times our rhetoric and actions could be consistent.

As we prospered and expanded, two very important elements were added to our initial power base. The industrial revolution and our efficient exploitation of immense reservoirs of natural resources added the element of economic power to the strong base of our moral power. It was not very difficult to translate our economic power into terms that meshed nicely with our moral strength. For a long time, although contradictions appeared and hypocracies existed, our economic and moral power bases complimented one another.

The depression changed the nature of our economic strength. The Federal Government found it necessary to take an increasingly larger role in the management of the economy.

Although the nature of our economic strength changed, the rhetoric has not and, as a result, there has been a controversy over what actually constitutes our economic strength. The depression was the second real test of confidence in our institutions. We survived and prospered, but our image was shaken and very important relationships between the Congress and the President were altered. Our initial moral strength, i.e., the delicate balance in our democratic institutions, was allowed to take a back seat in order to preserve our economic strength. Of course, this alteration took place in the name of preserving our moral power.

On the heels of the depression the World War brought to the forefront the third major element of our power—our military ability. Although we maintained a military establishment throughout our history, only in World War I and II and the period thereafter did it become the major expression of our power. Even after World War I our military power quickly receded and our moral and economic strengths preempted the field.

The military power component emerged after World War II as the most significant element in our power base. In the post World War II period we have become increasingly

dependent on the use of our military. But in almost every case we have justified the use of this power in order to promote and preserve the fundamental base of strength we possess—the moral strength emanating from our political institutions. We have stressed and emphasized the military component of our power, and, with the exception of the rhetoric, we have allowed both our moral and economic power to take minor roles. And once again, in emphasizing the military, we have given more power to the Presidency, thereby altering basic institutional arrangements.

Thus we have a cycle that has led us to our present circumstances. We have, in our actions, de-emphasized the first and most fundamental basis of our power—our moral strength—which is based on our institutions. Our preoccupation with using the military arm has de-emphasized the second most important element of our strength—our economy. The most visible manifestation of our power is our military, and this component, the last one to develop, is the least important component of our threefold base of power.

The emphasis on the military component is severely testing our institutions, the most fundamental basis of our moral power, and at the same time is damaging our economy. The great confusion, the great frustration, and the great sense of drift we now feel is directly caused by the emphasis of our power on the military component. Public leaders further confuse and frustrate when they justify the use of our military power as the principle means of preserving our moral and economic strength. For just the opposite is happening. Our continuing emphasis on the military expression of our power is eroding the two more fundamental strengths of our nation. As a result, it is rather obvious that our actions have not been consistent with our rhetoric and what has occurred is a national crisis in identity.

Unless we realize that this is what has happened we will not be able to effectively deal with the Indochina malaise. We must once again reinstate the two basic fundamentals of our power—the moral and economic. Our first concern must be with these, and honestly with these. Our rhetoric must be clear and truthful.

With this perspective it is obvious that if we are to preserve our more fundamental strengths we must disengage, militarily, from Indochina, as fast as we possibly can.

By reasserting our basic strengths we will once again offer a clear picture of who we are and where we are going—a prosperous country with strong democratic institutions. We will be able to keep our rhetoric consistent with our actions and thereby rebuild public confidence. We will also be able to restore the constitutional balance between our institutions.

BLOOD TRANSFUSION DEVICE SOLD

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Walter Jinotti, of New Brunswick, invented a blood transfusion device that will help save the lives of millions of persons.

The device, purchased by Baxter Laboratory, of Chicago, Ill., expects to have Mr. Jinotti's invention on the market in about 2 or 3 months. According to experts, the blood transfusion device has

great potential value, its application ranging from use in hospitals, to use on the battlefield.

I am proud that Mr. Jinotti, a technologist, has invented this promising device and I am also happy for the millions of persons it will help throughout the world.

An article from the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., on May 23, 1970, contains details of Mr. Jinotti's distinguished invention, "Blood Transfusion Device Sold."

The article follows:

[From the Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., May 23, 1970]

BLOOD TRANSFUSION DEVICE SOLD
(By Doris Brown)

Walter Jinotti's life-saving blood transfusion invention, which the Middlesex General Hospital technologist announced here in February 1969, has been bought by Baxter Laboratory of Chicago and within a few months will be available to hospitals throughout the world.

Staff physicians at Middlesex General Hospital, who have been using Jinotti's Constant Infusion Chamber for more than a year, hail the invention as a major breakthrough in blood transfusion and also foresee its use in the treatment of cancer and urological surgery.

Jinotti's invention can be used for both venous or intra-arterial blood transfusion or for injection of IV (intravenous) solution. It is expected to supplant present methods of transfusion because it is more reliable and less dangerous than those methods.

ONE OF A KIND

"There's nothing like it in the world," according to Dr. H. Stephen Brody, chief of urology at the hospital.

The self-contained device, which weighs two pounds and is smaller than a shoebox, promises to be of great value in emergencies and disasters.

"It will be particularly advantageous on the battlefield," Brody predicted.

He considers the invention "the finest method up to date that I have seen for rapid transfusion" and said that he had used it "at least three times." On one occasion, Brody awakened Jinotti "at 2 a.m. and said bring down the device."

"The thing we like about it is the fact that the flow is so fantastic. I pushed in a pint of blood in five minutes. I was amazed," Brody reported.

He cited his use of the Jinotti invention when a "patient was in shock in the emergency room and needed blood."

NO OPERATOR

The invention works without a human operator, so in emergencies "releases an extra pair of hands," Brody pointed out. Another boon "is that blood can be given at a constant rate while the patient is lying down."

The urologist is further enthusiastic over the versatility of Jinotti's invention. The device permits slow transfusion without the danger of clogging. He envisions its use in his own specialized field: "We feel it has many, many applications."

A larger adaptation of the device could be used for delivery of an irrigating solution that would provide better vision for the surgeon in performance of bladder and prostate operations, Brody said. "I use a system as old as the hills now," he said.

Brody was one of some 150 physicians who signed affidavits endorsing the invention more than a year ago.

PILOT TESTED

It was pilot tested by individual physicians at Middlesex General Hospital, two hospitals in New York City and one in Philadelphia.

Four other staff physicians at Middlesex General Hospital joined Brody in hailing the invention and its potentials when Jinotti this week disclosed purchase of the device by the Chicago laboratory.

Dr. Maxwell Borow, general surgeon and thoracic surgeon, spoke from personal experience, praising use of the device for rapid blood transfusion.

"I had a vascular case bleeding profusely. I was giving two bags (of blood) as a must to keep up with the patient," he said.

Borow said, "Usually it takes half an hour to transfuse a patient from a bag. With Mr. Jinotti's device, we get it in five minutes."

"It's been pilot-tested and found to be effective," said Dr. Jasper Van Avery, director of endocrinology, division of internal medicine.

ENDORSEMENT

Dr. Norman Rosenberg, director of surgery and chief of vascular surgery, also has been deeply interested in use of the device here over the past year and joined his colleagues in endorsing Jinotti's invention.

Dr. Robert J. Zullo, chief of medical oncology, was most "interested in the infusion of cancer," which Jinotti anticipates as an important potential for his invention.

Since the device "will pump any fluid and has other attachments," the inventor explained that it will greatly aid cancer treatment.

He envisioned use "for constant profusion of drug under high or low pressure into a cancer tumor for destroying cells with a flow of many hours under adjustable pressure."

NEW USES

"We have found new uses for the device at every turn," said Jinotti. He also foresees use of his invention for injecting dye for tests.

The technologist has been working for more than five years on this invention. He perfected a working model at the beginning of 1969.

Jinotti, who was brought here about 12 years ago by Rosenberg, was a pioneer heart pump operator at the hospital. He manned the pump for the team that performed the first successful open heart surgery there.

His work with the heart pump aroused his interest in the problem of providing a better device for blood transfusion and led to this invention.

Jinotti said that Baxter Laboratory expects to have his invention on the market "within two or three months."

He looks for its widespread use in hospitals throughout the world and expects, "there could be 20 or 30 in every hospital."

INSIDE NORTH VIETNAM

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the informative series on North Vietnam written by Robert S. Boyd, chief of the Knight Newspapers' Washington Bureau, continues daily in the Detroit Free Press. At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD the fourth through the eighth articles of this series:

LEADERS IN HANOI REFUSE TO BUDGE ON PEACE TERMS

(By Robert S. Boyd)

I left North Vietnam more discouraged about the prospects for peace in Indochina than when I arrived.

Even if President Nixon's Cambodian tactic temporarily blocks North Vietnamese supply

lines, I see little chance that they will give up their goals and sue for peace on our terms.

There is nothing like a set of interviews with leading officials in Hanoi to chase away any optimism on that score.

Their peace terms are a stone wall. They do not give an inch on the basic issues.

Nor, for that matter, has Mr. Nixon yielded a great deal on his side of the bargaining table.

His much-touted concessions (stopping the bombing, a partial withdrawal of U.S. troops, allowing the National Liberation Front a seat at the peace table) do not get down to the heart of the matter.

For the root cause of the war, the thing all the fighting has been about, is who shall control South Vietnam.

The Vietnamese communists fully intend to control it, interviews with their leaders and study of their official statements made clear.

And Richard Nixon has not yet decided to let them have it.

So—We're stuck.

Asked if there isn't some small step either side could propose—short of adopting the entire 10-point peace plan proposed by the communists—Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh shook his head.

Trinh was not likely, or course, to announce a change in the communist bargaining position in a newspaper interview. In fact, the North Vietnamese haven't budged from the 10 points even in private talks with U.S. negotiators in Paris.

Nevertheless, his answer was discouraging.

"The problem is whether Mr. Nixon agrees to renounce the aggression (in other words, get out of Vietnam)," he said.

"As long as there are aggressors on Vietnamese soil, we will fight on . . . until all the aggressors have been driven out," Trinh said.

"Peace is further removed than ever," agreed Ngo Dien, official spokesman for the foreign ministry.

"It is true that at present there is not much prospect for peace," said Luu Quy Ky, secretary-general of the North Vietnamese Journalists' Association.

"We shall have to carry on the fight persistently until Nixon gives up his daydreams and leaves Vietnam to settle its own affairs."

The North Vietnamese argue that Mr. Nixon's concessions in Paris are irrelevant and misleading.

For example, they claim his promise to withdraw all American forces eventually is spurious because he attaches an unacceptable condition to it: That North Vietnam also withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.

This they will never do, the North Vietnamese insist, because Vietnam is one country and they have a right to fight for their independence anywhere on their soil.

Mr. Nixon knows mutual withdrawal is out of the question, Hanoi says. Therefore his promise is a "mere deception," according to Foreign Minister Trinh.

Mr. Nixon actually intends a prolonged, Korean-style "occupation" of South Vietnam by a combined U.S.-South Vietnamese force, Trinh said.

His associate, Ngo Dien, said Hanoi doesn't even agree with the western concept of "bargaining" at Paris.

"We do not accept the idea of 'bargaining'—of giving one thing in return for something else," Dien said.

"It is not possible for us to negotiate away our independence, or any part of it. Before anything else, the United States must accept the independence of Vietnam—all Vietnam. Then agreement on other questions can follow."

Nevertheless, the North Vietnamese do

claim they have made some concessions of their own. They cite three:

They say they agreed to come to Paris before the United States halted all bombing north of the DMZ.

(But U.S. officials note that they refused to discuss anything except a complete bombing halt until that was ordered by LBJ.)

They say they are willing to negotiate details of a settlement before all U.S. troops actually leave Vietnam—provided the United States first agrees in principle to withdraw all its forces unconditionally.

(U.S. officials say this is like asking a fellow to drop his gun before you parley with him. The fellow would rather parley gun in hand.)

They say the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) set up by the National Liberation Front has a perfect right to rule South Vietnam by itself. But they are willing to refrain from exercising that right pending general elections.

In the interim, a temporary coalition government will be set up, including the PRG and other political factions in the south, to conduct the elections.

(U.S. officials suspect this is a trap. They fear the communists would permit only docile fellow-travelers in the coalition government. They would easily dominate it and take it over, as communists did in Eastern Europe after World War II.)

Other than these points, Hanoi's peace terms are rigid: The United States must get out, quickly, completely, and no questions asked.

What happens after that is none of our business, they say.

Some of the next steps are clear, however.

One of the first: Thieu and Ky must go. They will be replaced in Saigon by a "peace cabinet" representing all South Vietnamese factions that stand for "peace, independence and neutrality."

Who will decide who meets these fine-sounding standards?

"That is an internal matter for the South Vietnamese people," Foreign Minister Trinh said obscurely.

Hoang Tung, editor-in-chief of the official communist party newspaper, Nhan Dan, said one test for membership in the "peace cabinet" would be opposition to American troops remaining in Vietnam.

Just about anyone who will say "Yankee go home"—even Thieu—will be acceptable, Tung implied.

The "peace cabinet" then will negotiate with the PRG, and set up a temporary coalition government.

This government will oversee the U.S. troop withdrawal and run the country until general elections are held. No date is set for the elections.

Eventual reunification with the north is also specified, but again, no date is set.

Since Mr. Nixon has flatly rejected these terms for peace, what happens now?

The North Vietnamese say they are settling in for a long war.

"It is bound to be a long struggle," said Minister of Culture Hoang Minh Giam, an old associate of Ho Chi Minh's. "We must not be impatient."

"If our generation does not achieve victory, our children and grandchildren will," said Luu Quy Ky.

The North Vietnamese say they rule out nothing—renewed U.S. bombing of the north, an invasion of their country by a million men. If that happens, they will retreat to the mountains and wear us down in guerrilla war, they say.

The North Vietnamese economy is so primitive that it is almost invulnerable to American pressure—particularly as long as Russia and China are willing to supply her.

Thus, matched against an enemy whose economy is increasingly upset by the strain

of war, and whose public opinion is increasingly disenchanting, North Vietnam believes it can wait us out.

"The United States may be powerful, but you are not more powerful than we are on our own soil," said Ngo Dien. "You will never be able to win. In the end, we will certainly win."

FACELESS THREE RULE N. VIETNAM

(By Robert S. Boyd)

Quick now, who are Le Duan, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong?

Chances are you never heard of them.

But they are the three top men in one of the oldest and most stable ruling parties on the face of the earth today.

They dominate the government of North Vietnam, along with a dozen or so other key members of the Lao Dong (workers) Party founded by the late Ho Chi Minh.

The same tightly knit group has run North Vietnam since it declared its independence Sept. 2, 1945. They beat the French and have fought the United States to a standstill.

Other world leaders of those days—Harry Truman, Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin, Charles de Gaulle, Chiang Kai-Shek—are dead or out of real power.

But Le Duan, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong & Co. carry on.

As secretary general of the Lao Dong Party, Le Duan holds the key levers of power in a communist state. He laid down the current party line recently in a 40,000-word document published five months after Ho's death.

As chairman of the standing committee of the national assembly and chief ideologue of North Vietnam, Truong Chinh cracks the whip over intellectuals and keeps discipline tight.

As premier of the government in Hanoi, Pham Van Dong, one of Ho's earliest disciples, runs the day-to-day affairs of the regime. A neighbor says he works gruelling hours, and gets home to sleep only three or four nights a week.

Further down the line come Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, defense minister, commander-in-chief of North Vietnam's tough army and victor of Dienbienphu; Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh, chief Paris peace talks strategist Le Duc Tho, and other members of the Lao Dong "politburo."

They are a faceless bunch. There is as yet no single "star" in the collective leadership that took over when Ho died.

Ho's successor as president is 80-year-old Ton Duc Thang. Nobody has replaced Ho as chairman of the central committee of the Lao Dong Party.

The only subject of a "personality cult" is Ho himself. His is the only portrait that appears in public buildings. His sayings and advice are quoted everywhere. His praises are sung in music, dance, films and stories. Tiny shrines to Ho appear in villages and schools. In the countryside, he seems to be venerated almost like a reincarnation of Buddha.

But not Le Duan, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong & Co.

They remain anonymous, down to earth, ordinary.

They are said to travel about the streets without pomp or special security. Their wives are said to do their own shopping in the public stores.

The leaders apparently have no fear of their people, foreign residents agree.

Are they split into factions? Is there wrangling over who will succeed Ho as number one?

There is much speculation in the West about this. Some evidence has been gathered which seems to indicate that Truong Chinh heads a "hardline" group which favors the Chinese "protracted war" line. Le Duan is said to lead a more moderate, pro-Russian group.

The CIA reportedly holds the hawk-dove split theory. State Department experts are more skeptical.

Another policy question that is said to divide the North Vietnamese leadership is whether to concentrate more on "building socialism in the North" or focus first on "liberating the South."

Asked about this, minister of culture Hoang Minh Giam, a long-time associate of Ho Chi Minh, said:

"We give parallel and equal priority to North and South. The two are intertwined."

"If we do not pay due attention to the struggle against American aggression, there will be no more Vietnam. At the same time, we must pay due consideration to building socialism in the North, or we will not have the means to carry out the struggle in the South."

At any rate, it was impossible for an outsider in two weeks in North Vietnam to detect any signs of dissension.

Furthermore, it does not seem particularly important since, by all accounts, the leadership is united on the essentials: To get the Americans out of Vietnam and maintain their independence and freedom from all foreign interference—including, incidentally, Chinese and Russian.

When asked about a split, officials in Hanoi merely scoff.

"Your CIA claims our leadership is divided and that we have 'dissenting opinions,'" said Hoang Tung, editor-in-chief of the Lao Dong newspaper, Nhan Dan.

"Our leaders have been formed through 40 years of struggle. They have emerged from the heart of this struggle. This is the basic reason that our leaders have an identity of mind on the basic questions."

"On a host of secondary questions involving our life and struggle, they may have different views," Tung said. "This is reality and we encourage it."

In his long article, party chief Le Duan hinted at some internal disagreement and bickering:

"At present a number of comrades of the leading organs do not attach due consideration to the collective leadership principle," he wrote.

"There can be absolutely no concessions on matters of principle. However, a fair and just solution to complicated problems . . . is to know how to make concessions to each other when differences of views crop up."

At another point, he wrote:

"The struggle between old and new, between progress and backwardness arises inevitably and permanently inside the party . . ."

Le Duan quoted Ho's appeal for unity in his "Final Testament," written shortly before his death:

"Harmony is an extremely precious tradition of our party and of our people," Ho wrote. "Let all comrades, from the central committee to the cells at the party's base, preserve the harmony and unity of the party like the apple of their eye." It seems doubtful that that unity, forged in 40 years of struggle under Ho's leadership, will now be seriously shattered.

HANOI ARTFUL AT BALANCING ACT

(By Robert S. Boyd)

North Vietnam is a giant funnel. Out of the narrow neck at the bottom flow the arms and supplies to support the fighting men in the south.

Into the broad top comes an endless tide of food, weapons and equipment from its giant communist allies, Russia and China.

Without their help, North Vietnam could not feed herself—much less wage a protracted war against the United States.

With their help, North Vietnam can probably carry on its struggle indefinitely, until U.S. patience runs out.

Russian and Chinese aid seems assured as long as Hanoi wants it. There is no way the U.S. can cut it off without risking a major war.

Traveling through North Vietnam, I passed hundreds of trucks on the highway. About half were Russian, half Chinese.

The trucks bound south were loaded with six-inch pipe, petroleum, steel beams, pontoons for bridges, tires, tracked vehicles and other Soviet-supplied war materiel.

The trucks headed north were empty or carried wood. It was obvious where their cargo had gone.

The North Vietnamese railroad is kept running largely with Chinese equipment.

Ordinary citizens travel on Chinese bicycles. The powerful or favored move in Russian-made cars or jeeps.

Brand new tractors (I couldn't tell if they were Russian or Chinese) sit in crates by the railroad.

Chinese rifles and machine guns, Russian artillery pieces and of course the deadly SAM anti-aircraft missiles form a bristling defense against American raids.

To keep their funnel full, the North Vietnamese have performed an artful international balancing act.

Despite the quarrel between the Soviet Union and China, the North Vietnamese have managed to remain on good terms with both of them. Thanks and praise are always distributed even-handedly.

"Our people are eternally grateful for the extremely great and invaluable assistance of fraternal socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union and China," Le Duan, Secretary-General of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party, said in a February policy statement. Equal warnings are issued against "rightist and leftist deviation."

This tight-rope walk has not always been easy. When the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia to crush a liberal revolt in 1968, Hanoi was the first communist state to congratulate Moscow. But Peking vigorously condemned the Russian intervention.

When Cambodia's ousted Prince Sihanouk set up a government-in-exile in Peking last month, the Chinese and North Vietnamese promptly recognized it. But the Russians have not done so yet, and still maintain links with the rightist Lon Nol regime in Phnom Penh.

The Soviets openly boast that they persuaded North Vietnam to come to the peace talks in Paris. Peking still insists negotiations are a mistake and protracted war the only answer.

In his "final testament" before his death last September, Ho Chi Minh regretted the "misunderstanding" that spoiled communist unity.

Le Duan said: "Our party will devote all its efforts to restoring and safeguarding solidarity and single-mindedness in the socialist camp..."

While dependent on Russia and China for help, North Vietnam is determined to remain independent of both of them politically.

In fact, the great schism between the two Red Giants may actually make it easier for Hanoi to maintain her independent ways.

While some elements in Hanoi's leadership are regarded as more in tune with Chinese thinking, and others as more Russian-minded, they are all, first of all, pro-Vietnamese.

Hanoi's historical museums make no effort to hide the fact that Vietnam's traditional enemy, for 20 centuries, was China.

Her victories over Chinese invaders are celebrated with electrified maps, just like the triumph over the French at Dien Bien Phu. Heroines of the air war against the U.S. are compared to anti-Chinese heroines of yesterday.

As for the Russians, North Vietnam repeatedly disregarded Soviet advice to deploy

its SAM missiles in hardened concrete silos. Instead, the missiles are said to be kept mobile to avoid American bombers.

As party leader Le Duan put it in his February statement: "While attaching great importance to learning from the revolutionary experiences of the fraternal countries and parties... our party has constantly based itself upon the concrete realities emerging from the Vietnamese revolution and the realities of Vietnamese society..."

"The Vietnamese revolution's present great victories are attributed to the revolutionary lines and methods independently and creatively adopted by our party."

In other words: Thanks, Russia and China—but we'll run our own country our own way.

HANOI, SAIGON WORLDS APART

(By Robert S. Boyd)

A thousand miles lie between Hanoi and Saigon, the two capitals of the two Vietnams, but 16 years of separation and war have driven them even farther apart.

Hanoi is a primitive, oxcart and bicycle society—poor but clean, orderly, single-minded. Except for a small elite, everybody lives on the same spartan standard.

Saigon is a motorbike and limousine society—disorderly, dirty, corrupt and split six ways from Sunday. By official estimates, 50 percent live in squalor, 10 percent in luxury and the rest in between.

Hanoi enjoys the strengths of disciplined communist rule—and suffers the rigidity and stiffness of totalitarianism.

Saigon, for all its reputation as a military dictatorship, tolerates considerable dissent. It has vitality, flawed by doubt, dissension and dimness of purpose.

Fitting these two societies together, if the communists should ever reach their goal of unifying all Vietnam, would be a painful puzzle. Even the communists admit it might take 20 years.

Hanoi and Saigon have always been different, even though both are old Vietnamese cities with a heavy overlay of French culture.

Hanoi traditionally looked down on the lazy, decadent south. Saigon resented the ambition and zeal of the north. But now the gap between the two capitals has become a chasm.

Part of the difference stems from sheer numbers.

Hanoi is now half empty. Its 600,000 citizens are less than its pre-war population. Many of the people dispersed to the countryside during the U.S. bombing, especially the teen-agers, are still gone.

Saigon, on the other hand, is swollen beyond endurance. From 560,000 people in 1954 it now has 2,200,000. The mayor's office says this is the highest population density of any city in the world. In some quarters there is barely a square yard of ground per person.

Furthermore, Saigon is a city at war and looks it. There are rocketing and terror bombings almost every night. Barbed wire, pill-boxes and heavily armed troops are everywhere. Large sections of the city were occupied by the Vietcong during Tet two years ago. To get rid of them, the U.S. Air Force leveled an entire district where 200,000 people lived. The outer fringes of some districts are still unsafe.

Hanoi, for all its warlike rigor and fervor, is very far from the fighting. The slight damage from the U.S. bombing raids ended 18 months ago and has mostly been repaired. There are few armed men in sight, no barbed wire, no curfew. Even the famed one-man air raid shelters are neglected and full of trash.

Although both North and South Vietnam depend on huge doses of foreign aid, the foreign presence in Hanoi is almost invisible. In Saigon it is overwhelming.

Very few Russians or Chinese appear on the streets of the northern capital. A west-

erner is still an object of curiosity, followed by stares and packs of little boys.

In Saigon there is a sullen but understandable resentment of the hordes of outlanders who hog the best restaurants and prettiest girls, clog the streets, drive prices sky-high and meddle into everything.

But the gulf between the two cities goes deeper than this. It stems not only from their different political systems, but from life-styles that have clashed for centuries and led to earlier temporary divisions of the Vietnamese nation into two or, more often, three distinct parts.

Some contrasts jotted in my notebook after back-to-back visits to each capital:

Hanoi is a clean city. The streets are washed daily. The sidewalks are swept. There are few odors to bother western noses.

Saigon stinks. The air downtown is blue with fumes from Hondas and ancient taxis. By official estimate there are three gasoline-powered vehicles for every five feet of city streets. The smog is so thick you hardly notice the occasional reek of teargas. In the back streets, the stench of rotting garbage, open sewers and putrid canals shimmers in the hot sun.

Hanoi is quiet. The clomp-clomp of oxen and the creak of bicycles make a soothing background music. The only jarring noise is the persistent horn-blowing of the truck drivers and the periodic blasts of patriotic music and propaganda from the street loudspeakers.

Saigon is deafening. Helicopters and Hondas clatter through sky and street. In late afternoon on the once tranquil terrace of the continental palace hotel, where French colons sipped aperitifs, the constant roar drowns out conversation.

Hanoi has a simple, rustic gaiety. There is laughing and singing in the streets at night. But there are few restaurants, no bars, no dance halls or "cafe society." A few movie houses and state-sponsored cultural events make up the amusement world.

Until curfew Saigon has a hectic night-life. There are excellent restaurants with French, Chinese and Vietnamese cuisine. Bar girls, night clubs and strip-joints give a honky-tonk air.

Hanoi is poor but honest. You can safely leave several hundred dollars worth of local currency in your hotel room. The girls are plainly and modestly dressed in long pants and blouses.

Saigon is sodden with corruption. Everyone seems to have his hand in the till. Street urchins will snatch the watch right off your wrist. The black market teems. If you say no to the pimp offering a "nice young girl," he will suggest a "nice young boy."

Finally, Hanoi is as tight as a drum. There is one beat and everyone marches to it. The radio, press, movies, books, plays, dances and story tell a single tale. The communist party is right; everyone else is wrong. It resembles a well-run military post.

To an outsider, this tyranny does not look particularly repressive. In part, this is because it is useless to resist. Furthermore, it does provide a basic living for everyone, and that's more than many Asian governments do. The war appeals to patriotism and national pride, and also helps rally people behind their leaders.

In Saigon, on the other hand, the military men who operate the government tolerate a fair amount of looseness.

Much of the national assembly is in opposition, and the administration must wheedle necessary reform laws. Protests by students, veterans and Buddhists are treated with considerable latitude, although in the end the mailed fist comes down.

But the clash and interplay of ideas is reasonably open by Asian standards. The fan of opinion is far wider than in the north. The local papers print the criticisms of Sen. William Fulbright as well as the demands

of Saigon students. When papers go too far, that edition is seized, but the paper continues to publish.

In all its doubt and dissension and disorder, Saigon feels more like home to a westerner than Hanoi, with its iron discipline and rigid dogma, will ever be.

HANOI SAYS NIXON WORSE THAN LBJ (By Robert S. Boyd)

In North Vietnamese eyes, Richard Nixon is even worse than Lyndon Johnson was.

Although it was LBJ who bombed the day-lights out of their country, Mr. Nixon is considered even more "treacherous," "stubborn" and "cruel" than his predecessor.

In fact, they believe Mr. Nixon invented the Vietnam war.

In the museum of the revolution in Hanoi, which covers the 40-year struggle against French and then American intervention, there is an interesting exhibit devoted to Mr. Nixon.

It is dated 1953, and it shows him smiling and chatting with the former French puppet emperor, Bao Dai.

The caption asserts that this was when Mr. Nixon—then a freshman vice-president—conceived his policy of "using Vietnamese to fight Vietnamese."

Another display shows Mr. Nixon visiting Hanoi in the spring of 1954, before the French defeat. He toured Dien Bien Phu on that trip.

The exhibit recalls Mr. Nixon's April 1954, speech suggesting American aid to the French—a project which President Eisenhower rejected.

In other words, Hanoi dates Mr. Nixon's "Vietnamization" plan of 1970 back 17 years—even before the French collapse.

That's how long they say the President has been trying to make South Vietnam into an American "colony" by means of Vietnamese troops.

As a general rule, American presidents are not among North Vietnam's favorite people. The last good one, in their eyes, was Abraham Lincoln, whom Ho Chi Minh admired in his youth.

It is the North Vietnamese view:

That Woodrow Wilson fouled up by ignoring the young Ho's pleas for Vietnamese self-determination at the end of World War I.

That Franklin Roosevelt showed promise, but he died before he could be of much help.

That Harry Truman sold out to the French in 1946 and supported their campaign to hang on to their old colony.

That Dwight Eisenhower refused to hold the promised elections to reunite Vietnam in 1956. Instead, he created a tyrant, Ngo Dinh Diem, and put him in Saigon.

That John Kennedy beefed up the American "advisers" and launched a "special war" of counter-insurgency against "liberation forces" in South Vietnam.

That Lyndon Johnson "Americanized" the war with half a million GIs and expanded it to North Vietnam.

And now, at the bottom of the barrel, comes Richard Nixon.

Mr. Nixon's "Vietnamization" plan is crueler than LBJ's "Americanization" of the war, said Luu Quy Ky, Secretary General of the North Vietnamese Journalists Association.

"The cruelty lies in the fact that if Nixon uses the blood of other people, he will not be as economical with it as with American blood," Ky said.

Mr. Nixon is also more deceptive than LBJ, according to the North Vietnamese. Vietnamization is only a ruse to lull the American public, they argue. While cutting down U.S. casualties and costs, Mr. Nixon is actually prolonging and extending the war, they say.

The harshest indictment of Mr. Nixon I heard in my two weeks in North Vietnam came from Hoang Tung, a smiling, decep-

tively mild-mannered intellectual who is editor-in-chief of the official communist party newspaper, Nhan Dan (The People).

"Nixon has accelerated his own defeat—his political defeat at home and the defeat of his policies in Indochina," Tung said.

"Why? Because he has done things contrary to common sense, things that even those who used to agree with him now dissent from, things that even President Johnson dared not do."

Specifically, Tung cited what he called Mr. Nixon's "escalation" of the war in Laos, the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia (which Hanoi claims was a CIA plot), and now the invasion of Cambodia.

"Mr. Nixon even succeeded in making a communist ally out of Cambodia's pleasure-loving Prince Sihanouk," Tung scoffed.

"We couldn't do that," he said. "But your Nixon did."

The editor said sarcastically that Mr. Nixon undertook the Cambodian operation only days after his secretary of state told Congress it wouldn't be done, and after a Senate committee voted against helping the Lon Nol government of Cambodia.

"Nixon acted in defiance of the Legislature," Tung said. "His acts bring much dissent. He is more unpopular than Kennedy or Johnson."

Tung added: "Nixon claims his 'silent majority' supports him. But that is self-deception. The votes cast for Nixon in your last election were not meant for him to expand the war, but to end it."

A number of American bomb casings that have fallen on Vietnamese soil have been derisively painted with Mr. Nixon's name.

Billboards, slogans and cartoons mock him, and one day, in the southern part of the country, while American planes were roaring overhead on a bombing mission, a 23-year-old girl looked up and said quietly: "Nixon's airplanes."

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleasures of representing the 17th District of Pennsylvania is the fact that it contains the capital city of international Little League baseball.

I am sure we are all aware of the outstanding contributions this organization has made in developing the character and fitness of so many of our young men. Those of us from Williamsport are particularly proud of the role our city has played in the development of this outstanding international activity.

On this observance of National Little League Baseball Week, which continues through Saturday, I would like to share with my colleagues the following article, which was published by the Williamsport Grit on June 7:

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

Little League Baseball will observe its 31st anniversary beginning Monday with the observance of National Little League Baseball Week. The observance will continue through Saturday.

Spreading its wings from its humble beginning in this city 31 years ago, Little League Baseball will be celebrated by more than 2,000,000 participants, their parents, and leaders of more than 6,000 communities across the United States and the world.

Little League activities all over the world are run from the headquarters in South Williamsport where Peter J. McGovern, president of L.L.B., and other administrators have their offices.

The sport for boys 8 to 12 has come a long way since the first game was played on the sandlot field at the Park Point (outside the right-centerfield fence at Bowman Field) June 7, 1939.

The growth of Little League has been fast and there are more leagues this year than there were last year. Last year there were 6,256 Little Leagues (8 to 12 age), 1,477 Senior Leagues (13 to 15), and 249 Big Leagues (16 to 18) teams. There are close to 8,000 leagues this year although the computer hasn't come up with a final figure.

L. L. B. Week comes by Presidential proclamation, starting with the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The week calls for nationwide attention to the Little League movement as a wholesome, beneficial experience carried on in the public interest for boys throughout the world. Local communities conduct special events during this period to highlight the activities of the program and to encourage support and interest.

The nearly 8,000 leagues in the U.S. and foreign lands have received letters from McGovern and James A. Farley, of New York City, president of the Little League Foundation, asking for continued support for the foundation that was federally chartered Feb. 11, 1955.

Little League is the only sports agency in the United States to hold federal charter of incorporation and its role in cultivating a climate of decency, discipline, and teamwork is vital to the preservation of American ideals.

Today hundreds of former Little Leaguers are now major league stars. Included are 14 of the 25 world champion New York Mets, including Tom Seaver, Nolan Ryan, Ken Boswell, Bud Harrelson, Ed Kranepool, and Ron Swaboda. Boog Powell, of the American League champion Baltimore Orioles is a former Little Leaguer.

Other major league stars that played Little League ball include Carl Yastrzemski, of the Boston Red Sox; Danny Cater and Roy White, of the New York Yankees; Richie Allen and Nelson Briles, of the St. Louis Cardinals; Tommy Helms and Tony Perez, of the Cincinnati Reds; Bill Freehan and Micky Lolich of the Detroit Tigers, and Rusty Staub, of the Montreal Expos.

PENN CENTRAL CASE PROVES THE NEED FOR A NEW RFC

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the credit problems of the giant Penn Central Transportation Co. illustrate once again the failings of our commercial banking system.

There is simply no source of big credit at reasonable terms and this becomes particularly apparent during periods of tight money.

This huge corporation went into the markets and was unable to raise money with debentures bearing 10½-percent interest rates. Had there been a bank of last resort such as the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation—RFC—this corporation would have been able to negotiate an immediate loan at reason-

able interest rates. Its difficulties would not have reached the crisis stage had there been an RFC.

What is startling is the fact that Penn Central is a huge corporation with \$7 billion in assets. Despite this size, this corporation could not obtain the necessary funds and this raises the question of what is happening to the small and medium size companies around the Nation. If a \$7 billion corporation is choked off from credit sources, then what must be happening to the average businessman?

We need a source of funds in a bank of last resort—something modeled after the successful Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC was able to provide reasonable credit for corporations as well as for many needed public projects—schools, water and sewer facilities, parks, and the like.

The Nation should take a close look at what has happened to Penn Central and realize that we cannot continue under such a risky system minus a source of credit where it is needed. We are not talking about taking any business away from the commercial banks. We are talking about an RFC-type bank as a lender of last resort. In other words, when the banks turn down a worthy borrower, a development bank—an RFC—could fill the breach and make the credit available at reasonable terms.

Mr. Speaker, these would be loans which would be repaid with interest. Over a period of years, the bank would probably become essentially self-supporting with the repaid loans serving as a revolving fund. The RFC was a successful operation in the 1930's and 1940's and early 1950's and the Congress should never have allowed it to expire.

I hope my colleagues will give strong consideration to reviving something similar to meet the needs of the 1970's.

COLONEL CERAR BEGINS NEW DUTIES AUGUST 15

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Col. Paul R. Cerar, former post commander at Edgewood Arsenal, will retire from the U.S. Army on August 1 of this year. I should like to commend him for his long years of devoted service to his country by including the following article in the RECORD:

ARSENAL COMMANDER TO TAKE POST AT HARFORD JUNIOR COLLEGE—COLONEL CERAR BEGINS NEW DUTIES AUGUST 15

Col. Paul R. Cerar, who will retire from the United States Army on Aug. 1, will assume the position of coordinator of cooperative work experience and occupational education at Harford Junior College on Aug. 15.

Announcement was made last week by the H.J.C. board of trustees that the 51-year-old former Post Commander at Edgewood Arsenal has been selected for the position.

The president of HJC, Dr. Joseph Hankin, said Col. Cerar would coordinate the development of cooperative work-study programs with appropriate industries.

He was one of the eight to ten people

interviewed and had the most balanced qualifications, said Dr. Hankin.

Along with his other duties, Col. Cerar will help in the coordination of community service projects including adult education, community use of college services and facilities as well as development of cultural and recreational projects.

He has served as Post Commander since 1967 and has also been deputy director for chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear operations for the Army General Staff during 1966-67.

He was also deputy director and commander of planning and evaluation at the test center in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Col. Cerar first served in Harford county at Edgewood for two years from 1949-51 as an instructor and executive officer of the radiological defense branch of the Chemical Warfare School.

He has also had experience as ground munitions branch chief and munitions branch chief of the now defunct research and development labs at the Arsenal.

Col. Cerar is a graduate of West Point and holds his master's degree in physics from Columbia. He taught physics for three years at the Academy and later trained staff officers for NATO in Naples.

He and his wife, Vivian, have two sons, Paul R. Jr., and Jeffrey. The Cerars recently purchased a residence in the Bel Air area.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Baltic States Freedom Day, which is observed annually and which will be commemorated this year on Sunday, June 14, marks the 30th anniversary of a tragedy in the history of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

On June 14, 1941, the Soviet Union forces overran these three countries which were enjoying independence and freedom since 1920. Innocent Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were ruthlessly deported to Siberia, causing the death of tens of thousands of freedom-loving people.

We Americans have not forgotten the tragic events that took place 30 years ago. And these events give us all cause to reflect on the fragile nature of human freedom.

The Soviets are to be condemned for violating a solemn international treaty which was signed in 1920 at which time the Soviets renounced "voluntarily and forever" all sovereign rights over the peoples and territories of the Baltic States. This treaty, along with so many treaties concurred in by the Soviets have been abrogated and affected the lives of millions of freedom-loving peoples.

The United States has never recognized the illegal and unlawful usurpation of the Baltic region by the Soviets. Our State Department continues to deal with the diplomatic representatives of the Baltic countries who served the last independent governments of these nations.

On this somber occasion, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant Baltic people.

It is my fervent wish that one day soon Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will again be enjoying freedom as independent nations.

SUPPLY OF INDUSTRIAL RAW MATERIALS, UNITED STATES VERSUS THE SOVIET UNION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as one concerned with the overall natural resources, in fact resource shortages, in the United States, I found the following paper by Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research and professor of chemical engineering, State University of New York at Buffalo, of great interest. The House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, was honored to have Dr. Ewell present this information as testimony June 10.

Twelve years ago Dr. Ewell prepared an article on education and research in the Soviet Union in which he presented 13 general conclusions regarding Russia.

A look at these 13 conclusions and the new article which follows entitled "Supply of Industrial Raw Materials, United States versus the Soviet Union," will clearly indicate, I think, that we must do more in this country toward building up our reserves of natural resources.

Dr. Ewell's paper clearly shows more incentives are needed if we are to hold our own in this fundamental field. I want to call attention particularly to the action recommendations—the need for forceful and innovative diplomatic initiatives.

This paper also clearly shows the need to keep our economic position strong through the employment of ingenious new ways of encouraging domestic exploration for all minerals and other natural resources:

SOME GENERAL CONCLUSIONS REGARDING RUSSIA

1. Russia is a more formidable adversary than most Americans realize. It is a big, powerful, well managed nation—here to stay for the foreseeable future.

2. One of the most important reasons Russia is a formidable adversary is the character of the Russian people themselves. They are vigorous, dynamic, intelligent, self-confident, well disciplined people, who would clearly give a very good account of themselves in any conflict.

3. Russia is a country in a hurry. It is moving up fast in the world. Most Russians are well aware of this fact and quite proud of it, too. Everyone works hard in Russia whether he (or she) is a research scientist, a factory worker, a train attendant, a waitress, or a hat check girl (and no tips).

4. Russia is a country with few frills or luxuries, but the people are adequately supplied with the necessities of life. This policy enables the planners to divert more of the national product into capital investment, military development, and education.

5. Russia is on a strong upturn in all aspects of its national development—education, research, industry, military power, standard of living, capacity to influence other countries, and self-confidence of the people. From what I saw in Russia this will prob-

able become increasingly apparent during the next five to 10 years.

6. For this last reason it is very difficult for the United States to make calculations on the effect of one program or another in getting us or keeping us ahead of the Russians. Russia is moving so fast that U.S. policy will have to be dynamic in order to have any assurance we will stay ahead or get ahead of the Russians. This is a fluid, dynamic situation and only fluid, dynamic policies will enable us to keep a balance of power with Russia.

7. Thinking and planning at all levels in Russia is characterized by "forward" thinking—not "status quo" thinking or "rest-on-your-laurels" thinking. Everyone is looking to and working towards the future—five, 10, or 20 years.

8. In addition to the present military threat, Russia gives promise of presenting a strong economic threat to the United States and Western Europe. I was told that Russia plans to export large quantities of manufactured goods of all types within the next five to 10 years, including automobiles, cameras, watches, machine tools, electrical, radio and television equipment, chemicals, and textiles.

9. In meeting the basic needs of the people for food, clothing, and shelter, Russia today is about where the U.S. was in 1900 to 1910. In transportation and medical services they are relatively farther ahead, possibly about where we were in 1930 to 1936.

10. The present government in Russia seems to be quite stable and unlikely to be dislodged in the foreseeable future. Economically Russians are the best off they have ever been in history. Therefore, the people are reasonably contented with their lot and do not complain. Russians simply do not comprehend individual freedom as we understand it, and therefore, place little value on freedom.

11. Russian thinking is influenced by the fact that they live in a big country with vast distances and limitless natural resources. This causes them to think "big" like Americans, rather than thinking "small" as Western Europeans tend to do.

12. Russia is making much more effective use of manpower than the U.S. Women work in all types of factories, in transportation, construction, and agriculture. Women comprise 30 to 40% of engineering students, 90% of medical students.

13. The big threat from the Soviet Union is not now or next year or even five years from now. The big threat, for which we must prepare, is 10 and 20 years from now. The Russians are in the middle of a tremendous educational and economic buildup which has a long way to go yet. It takes time to develop the kind of momentum they now have, and this is why decisions and action are needed in the U.S. now.

SUPPLY OF INDUSTRIAL RAW MATERIALS, UNITED STATES VERSUS THE SOVIET UNION (By Raymond Ewell)

The high level of affluence in the United States is consuming industrial raw materials at a very high rate—and at a steadily increasing rate as our level of affluence continues to go up. Most of these industrial raw materials are of mineral origin, such as petroleum, natural gas, iron ore, copper, chromium, nickel, aluminum, etc. In addition, we get lumber, good pulp and natural rubber from forest resources. And, we get cotton, wool and a few other industrial raw materials from agricultural sources. Virtually no important industrial raw materials come from the ocean (other than offshore petroleum production). In this discussion I am referring only to non-food raw materials.

Our domestic mineral and forest resources are being rapidly depleted so that the United

States is being forced to import more and more of our industrial raw materials. This trend has been going on for many years, but at an accelerating rate during the past 20 years. I estimate that out of the 32 most important industrial raw materials consumed by our manufacturing industries the United States is self-sufficient in only 7 of these materials, and we have to import all or part of our requirements of 25 materials (see table attached).

Large-scale importation of so many materials vital to our well-being leads to many economic and political problems and obviously has an adverse effect on our international balance of payments. As our shortages of industrial raw materials develop still further, this will have the effect of slowing the rate of increase of our standard of living and eventually lead to a leveling off and still later to an actual decline in our standard of living. This may happen in the next 20 to 30 years.

This prospect is magnified even more by the expected growth of population in the United States. The population of the United States is now 205 million and currently growing at 1 percent per year. If this rate continues United States population will be 275 million in the year 2000. It will obviously be more difficult to provide a high standard of living for 275 million than for 205 million persons.

If it were not for the competition for world leadership between the United States and the Soviet Union, the most serious result of this trend of affairs on the people of the United States would be a gradual decline in our material standard of living. This would not be too disastrous. We could undergo a considerable decline in our material standard of living and it wouldn't hurt us any. In fact, we could more than compensate for this by improving the cultural life in our country.

But the competition for world leadership between the United States and the Soviet Union puts an entirely different light on this picture. At the same time that the raw material position of the United States is declining, the raw material position of the Soviet Union is becoming stronger. Of the 32 major industrial raw materials, the Soviet Union is self-sufficient in 27 and needs to import only 5 of these materials (see table).

Today the Soviet Union has much greater reserves of mineral and forest resources than the United States, and known reserves of mineral resources in the Soviet Union are steadily increasing as new deposits are discovered. As recently as 1950 the known reserves of mineral resources in the United States exceeded those of the Soviet Union, but during the past 20 years the mineral resources of the United States have gone down while those of the Soviet Union have gone up. I would estimate that the cross-over point was about 1955.

For example, the Soviet Union now greatly exceeds the United States in such basic mineral resources as petroleum, natural gas, iron ore, aluminum ore, lead/zinc ore, chromium, and manganese, in addition to other vital materials such as gold, platinum and diamonds. In addition, the Soviet Union has incomparably greater forest resources than the United States or even the United States and Canada combined.

The Soviets started in earnest after World War II to explore Siberia and other areas of the Soviet Union for mineral deposits. They have been spectacularly successful in this endeavor, and have discovered large new deposits of many minerals, including many metallic and non-metallic minerals besides petroleum, natural gas and coal. The Soviets have put particular emphasis on the training of geological scientists and engineers for this task ever since the 1930's. When I was

in the Soviet Union in 1957 I was told that they were graduating six times as many geologists as the United States.

The Soviet Union is a very large country as shown by the following data:

Soviet Union, 8,700,000 square miles.
United States (including Alaska), 3,600,000 square miles.

United States-Canada, 7,400,000 square miles.

U.S.A.-Canada-Mexico, 8,200,000 square miles.

The geological exploration of the Soviet Union is still in full swing and still more mineral discoveries can be expected in the future.

Even though the Soviet Union in 1970 has much greater reserves of industrial raw materials than the United States, our total industrial production greatly exceeds that of the Soviet Union. The ready availability of raw materials at economic prices is one of the principal determinants of industrial production, but there are other important determinants, too. Our deficiency in raw materials vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in 1970 is more than compensated by the following factors:

1. Proximity of Canada and Mexico as ready sources of industrial raw materials.
2. Superior technology in nearly every industry.
3. Better research and development—the source of our superior technology.
4. More productive labor.
5. More efficient organization and management in industry.

The importance of Canada (and to a lesser extent, Mexico) cannot be over-emphasized. Canada is a vast storehouse of industrial raw materials which are virtually as accessible as if they were within our own borders. Without Canada our raw material position would be much more precarious than it is now. Moreover, Canada is still in an exploratory phase, geologically speaking, whereas the United States (except Alaska) has been quite thoroughly explored.

While the above five factors are keeping us ahead of the Soviets in industrial production for the present, this will become increasingly difficult to do as the raw material gap between the United States and the Soviet Union continues to widen in the years ahead. By 1990 or 2000, the Soviet superiority in raw materials will become so overwhelming that we may not be able to maintain our lead in industrial production, including both military and non-military production.

Another aspect of the industrial competition between the United States and the Soviet Union is the following. While total industrial production in the United States is greater than the Soviet Union, a large part of U.S. industrial production is luxury consumer products which the Soviets do not even make or produce in only token quantities. Automobiles for everybody, the vast array of electrical appliances, motor boats, expensive sports equipment, instant foods, cosmetics, elaborately equipped single-family homes are examples of luxury consumer products that make up the "super-affluent society." Such products comprise a major part of U.S. industrial production but are made on a very small scale or not at all in the Soviet Union.

Soviet industrial production is still largely concentrated on production of basic materials (such as steel, cement, petroleum, and fertilizer), capital equipment and military equipment. Soviet production of some basic products is nearly as high as that of the United States and will probably exceed the United States in some cases within the next 10 years. A few examples will illustrate this point:

	Actual, 1968		Reasonable estimate, 1980	
	United States	U.S.S.R.	United States	U.S.S.R.
Steel (million metric tons).....	123	107	150	170
Cement (million metric tons).....	68	88	85	125
Coal (million metric tons).....	507	594	600	750
Petroleum (million metric tons).....	430	309	550	550
Natural gas (billion cubic meters).....	603	171	1,000	400

If these estimates are anywhere near right, this means that in 1980 the Soviet Union will be substantially ahead of the United States in production of steel, cement, and coal, about even in petroleum, but still lagging in natural gas. The United States will probably still be ahead in production of non-ferrous metals as a group, but not by very much.

Steel, cement, coal, petroleum and other basic products are the "sinews of industrial power" which constitute the real foundation of a country's economic power. Luxury consumer products do not add to a country's economic power, and in fact undoubtedly detract from a country's economic power in the context of competition between two giants such as U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

But the big difference between Soviet and U.S. industrial production is that Soviet production is solidly based on domestic raw materials whereas the United States is having to depend more and more on raw materials imported from all over the world.

Does this situation add up to a real danger to the United States? I would say that it does. The Soviet Union has had world domination as its primary goal ever since 1917 and the penultimate step in achieving that goal is to surpass the United States in economic, political and military power. The United States has been the world's number one power in every sense of the word since 1918. The Soviet Union seeks to displace the United States from that position and be recognized as the number one power. At present the United States has a GNP nearly double that of the Soviet Union, but in basic industrial power, (steel, petroleum, cement, etc.) the two countries are nearly even. The Soviet Union has been gaining on the United States steadily ever since the end of World War I. The Soviet Union's increasingly predominant position in raw materials is a major factor in swinging the balance in favor of the Soviet Union.

How will this situation constitute a danger to the United States? Once the Soviet Union feels they are beginning to pull ahead of the United States in "basic industrial power" and believing that military and political power follow industrial power, the Soviet Union may begin to put political pressure on suppliers of raw materials to reduce or stop shipments to the United States and/or raise prices of raw materials to the United States and her allies. Countries which might conceivably be pressured in this way include Libya, Zambia, Congo, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Turkey, Iran, India, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Finland, Sweden, Greece, Yugoslavia, and perhaps even South American countries.

If such a stratagem succeeded even in part, the United States would be faced with worsening terms of trade in raw materials and a very difficult problem of obtaining enough raw materials to feed our industries. If the Soviets could engender even a partial interdiction of the flow of raw materials from other continents to the United States, this would have a disastrous effect on our industrial production.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

In order to counteract such a possible sequence of events, the United States should take all possible economic, diplomatic and legislative steps to strengthen our relationships with key areas now supplying raw materials to us.

My recommendations for action are:

1. Continue to cultivate the best possible relationships with Canada and Mexico, our two next door neighbors.

2. Continue to cultivate the best possible relationships with Australia and New Zealand.

3. Continue to maintain good relations in Europe, particularly with the non-Communist countries and with Yugoslavia, since Europe is still a significant source of some industrial raw materials.

4. Greatly improve our relationships with all South American countries, if necessary by making much greater concessions than we have in the past.

5. Develop a zone of political and economic influence in West and South Africa, from Morocco to South Africa.

Canada and Australia are of first importance, with Mexico and New Zealand of lesser importance. Canada and Australia both have enormous untapped mineral resources and probably still undiscovered resources.

South America is a vast storehouse of raw materials, and it is absolutely essential that the United States take any and all necessary steps to insure our continued access to the raw materials of this great continent.

Africa is probably the greatest remaining storehouse of raw materials, and I am recommending that the United States should develop a zone of political and economic influence in West and South Africa. Many of the countries of West and South Africa are important sources of industrial raw materials for the United States, notably Morocco, S.W. Africa, Nigeria, Gabon, Congo (Kinshasa), Zambia, Rhodesia, Angola, and Republic of South Africa. West Africa is now becoming an important source of petroleum, in addition to many minerals. East Africa is important, too, but it is farther away and therefore less accessible in a turbulent world. And North Africa, except Morocco, seems likely to be dominated by the Soviet Union within a few years.

Asia, although the largest continent, is least important to the United States as a source of critical raw materials. Also, it is far away. The United States could get along without Asia altogether, if we had unrestricted access to raw materials from Canada, Australia, Mexico, South America and West and South Africa. It is true we now get tin and natural rubber from Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, manganese, mica and jute from India, copper, copra and hemp from the Philippines, petroleum from the Persian Gulf, et al., but we could get along without any of these raw materials from Asia. Turkey is a special problem in west Asia since it is a member of NATO but is gradually being outflanked by the Soviet Union.

The important industrial raw materials are petroleum, iron ore, uranium, copper, lead, zinc, nickel, manganese, chromium, cobalt and some others, and the United States has access to adequate supplies of these raw materials if we obtained none of them from Asia. Tin might be a problem, but we could probably get along with western hemisphere sources of tin plus the further development of substitutes for tin.

RESEARCH AND NEW TECHNIQUES OF DISCOVERY

In addition to making our foreign sources of raw materials more secure, the United States should accelerate research on (1) new methods of utilizing lower grades of domes-

tic minerals and (2) new techniques of discovery of new domestic sources of minerals. In a country as large as the United States (and Canada and Mexico, too) there are undoubtedly large mineral deposits which have not yet been discovered. New, more sophisticated techniques of discovery need to be developed in order to enlarge our domestic sources of minerals.

CONCLUSION

The present and future superior position of the Soviet Union in raw materials compared to the United States presents a real economic and political threat to our country.

The United States should take steps to insure continued access to raw materials from Canada, Mexico, Australia, South America and West and South Africa. Also, the United States should accelerate research on methods of utilizing lower grades of minerals and on new methods of discovery of minerals.

Comparison between the United States and the Soviet Union of self-sufficiency and non-self sufficiency in major industrial raw materials

(Including all industrial raw materials with worldwide consumption over \$100 million per year, except food raw materials)

United States

Self-sufficient: Coal, uranium, molybdenum, titanium, sulfur, phosphate rock, and cotton.

Not self-sufficient: iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, tin, nickel, cobalt, mercury, chromium, manganese, tungsten, silver, gold, platinum, diamonds, bauxite, asbestos, potash, petroleum, natural gas, leather hides, wool, lumber, wood pulp, and, natural rubber.

Soviet Union

Self-sufficient: Coal, uranium, molybdenum, titanium, sulfur, phosphate rock, cotton, iron ore, lead, zinc, nickel, cobalt, mercury, chromium, manganese, tungsten, silver, gold, platinum, diamonds, asbestos, potash, petroleum, natural gas, wool, lumber, and wood pulp.

Not self-sufficient: copper, tin, bauxite, leather hides, and natural rubber.

This list omits some large-volume, low-priced raw materials such as salt, sand, clay, limestone, crushed stone, et al. in which most large countries are self-sufficient and which do not enter into international trade to any great extent.

LOYALTY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate for Hamden, Conn., that C. Malcolm Johnson is moving to Cape Cod, Mass. Mal has contributed much to Hamden. His service and hard work in community affairs were among the reasons that Mal was honored by over 500 friends at a dinner on May 28, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to insert the remarks of Mr. Samuel Mann, Worshipful Master of Olive Branch Lodge, No. 84, A.F. & A.M., made at the dinner honoring C. Malcolm Johnson.

LOYALTY

I always find it necessary, when I hear myself spoken in a way that I hardly recognize, to point out that I am confident to deliberately be a comprehensionist, in a word that seems to be completely preoccupied with specialization...

Let's take a look at that word "Loyalty" . . . The dictionary defines loyalty as being

steadfast in allegiance to one's country, government, or sovereign; faithful to a person, ideal, or custom . . . How accurate, this is rather naked explanation of the meaning of the word . . . To me it means much more . . .

To me loyalty is that quality which prompts a person to be true to the things he understands . . . It means definite direction, fixity of purpose . . . Loyalty supplies power and poise . . . It is a quality woven through the very fabric of one's being and it makes that thing to which you are loyal . . . Yours . . . Loyalty gives success to those who are true to the cause which they undertake . . . Loyalty is positive, it is active—it's alive . . . Now we know the meaning of that word.

Mal Johnson is retiring now and I do not want him to leave without public notice that Olive Branch Lodge #84, is losing a good Mason—my Junior Warden—a worker and an honest one. He had those traits of perceptiveness and understanding which made all of us comfortable in turning over our precious ideas and our Masonic fortunes to his idealistic treatment . . .

Olive Branch Lodge and its membership, are richer for the work that has been done by C. Malcolm Johnson, Junior Warden.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS, JUNE 1, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following report I sent to my constituents on June 1:

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

At its best, the American health care system is spectacular. It has produced the Salk vaccine and eliminated the terror of polio. It has prolonged life by some 20 years in the last 60 years. It has made an unprecedented assault on disease with antibiotics, drugs and life-saving technology.

But the system is showing signs of stress and strain. Health costs are spiraling and resources are growing short. The pressures of an exploding population and a growing shortage of medical professionals are beginning to tell.

Complaints concern the unavailability of care for the poor and the isolated; long hours in the waiting room; hurried and sometimes impersonal attention; difficulty in obtaining night and weekend care, high drug costs, and loopholes in insurance coverage.

Physicians' fees are increasing at twice the rate of the consumer price index, and hospital costs are rising at three times the consumer price index. While 75 percent of the U.S. population is covered by some form of health insurance, only about one-third of its medical bills are paid through insurance. Most Americans could still be financially destroyed by a prolonged and serious illness in the family.

The growing dissatisfaction with our health delivery system . . . the increasing costs of health care . . . the shortcomings of our health insurance plans all are issues which already are before the Congress. Pressures are mounting for public and private sectors to provide effective, affordable, high-quality care to all Americans.

The extent of the Federal government's participation in the health care system already is substantial. Federal outlays now account for 28 percent of the Nation's total health expenditures. In fiscal year 1969,

Medicare, with outlays of \$6.6 billion, and Medicaid, with outlays of \$4.4 billion, accounted for 55 percent of the Federal, State and local governments' bill for health services and supplies.

The Federal budget provides about 60 percent of all funds spent for health research, with industry contributing 28 percent, and foundations, voluntary health agencies and others contributing 11 percent. Thirteen Federal agencies are engaged in some form of health research, accounting for expenditures totaling \$1.6 billion this fiscal year.

Federal contributions to the construction of health care facilities in fiscal year 1969 amounted to \$360 million—about 15 percent of the total cost. The largest Federal program in this area is the Hill-Burton program. From 1946 to 1970, this program approved construction or modernization of about 467,000 hospital and long-term care beds costing about \$12 billion, of which the Federal share was \$3.7 billion.

The Federal government also is increasing its participation in community and regional health programs. Grants for ambulatory care centers will amount to about \$40 million in fiscal year 1970. Another \$26 million will be spent in fiscal year 1971 in the Partnership for Health Program, which assist States, regions and communities in planning and implementing health care programs. An estimated \$68 million will be allocated in 1971 for regional programs to improve health service and technology in specific regions of the country.

Yet, even with this kind of Federal participation, the Nation faces a crisis in health care. Roger Egeberg, assistant secretary for health in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said recently: "This Nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care, unless action is taken by the government and the private sector."

The great technological achievements of our health care system pale a bit when we realize that 15 other countries have longer life expectancies than the U.S.; 14 other countries have a lower rate of infant mortality, and five have better maternal mortality rates.

The subject of health care and the disparity between its capabilities and its availability to large numbers of Americans will be the debate of the 1970s in the Congress.

JOHN J. ROONEY

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as I reviewed my many years in the House of Representatives, I thought of the very many friends I had made, of the many who have departed, and of the many who still serve with me. I thought of JOHN J. ROONEY who came to the House 26 years ago and who brought with him, as I did years before, the feel and heart of Brooklyn, the intimate knowledge of the people, and the sixth sense of what Brooklyn wants and needs.

I maintain Brooklyn is unique; its quality is like no other quality in the United States. It has a vitality and particular sensitivity that is known only to those who have worked long and hard to meet the infinite variety of the needs of its people. Such a man is JOHN ROONEY.

I recall how we worked together on liberal legislation before the House, on mat-

ters relating to immigration and refugees, and how we joined forces to help the new State of Israel. The decisiveness of JOHN ROONEY is nowhere better shown than when he stated his conviction that we must withdraw from South Vietnam stating, "not next year nor next month but now."

The loyalty of JOHN ROONEY cannot be questioned, the loyalty that runs through to his friends, to his constituents and, above all, to his country. I am happy to have gained a portion of that loyalty from JOHN ROONEY, my colleague and friend.

SCOUT POWER TIDIES THE HACKENSACK

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when so much space is accorded the destruction and irresponsibility of some youths, it is encouraging and heartening to see what youth can do to achieve immediate, wholesome results for the community and environment.

I point to an ambitious project carried out by "a thousand or more heroes from Bergen County," N.J., as an example that typifies the attitudes, motivation and action of young people, but which we read and hear of too seldom.

If this is an apparently uncommon example of youthful endeavors, it is only because of the large scale of the operation. A thousand volunteers spending four Saturdays. But it is typical of the purposefulness of today's youth.

I offer this commendation for the Record of their performance not as a rejoinder to recalcitrants or an admonishment to accusers, but as a report of what is going on today in the minds and actions of most of our youth.

In pictures which I am unable to show, and words which I set forth here, the June 12 issue of Life magazine reports the following:

Everyone talks about the environment, but along New Jersey's Hackensack River, Girl Scout Troop 127 has gone into action. Last fall when the girls went down to plant ivy along the banks of the shallow-slow stream that flows past the town of River Edge, they found the river and its banks so fouled by junk and trash that no amount of ivy would have done any good. The scouts might have said "nice try" and given up the idea, but Troop 127 has a resourceful leader, Mrs. William Mars, and was utterly undaunted. Throughout the winter they agitated, got items in the paper, found a planner to work with them, spoke at meetings and badgered the county for help. Finally, thanks to their persistence, a thousand or more heroes from Bergen County—young and old, but mostly young—got out in the goo and muck and on four Saturdays last month pulled 60 big truckloads of assorted disfiguring debris from seven miles of the Hackensack.

Some captions from the article's pictures:

Some things people had dumped into the Hackensack over the years: auto springs, shopping carts, auto chassis, transmissions, fuel oil tanks, refrigerators, washing ma-

chines, motors, wheels, baby buggies, roller skates, bikes, trikes, dishpans, buckets, barrels and tires, tin cans, umbrellas, Christmas trees, dead pets, one stuffed mounted lamb and a red carpet three yards long. . . . Rescue squads with power winches on their trucks hauled out most of the heavy debris but sometimes, the best and only way was the combined pulling power of Girl Scouts from several Bergen County troops—plus an assistant or two.

The idea that the Hackensack might be more than the wet eyesore it evidently became goes back a long way—to Teddy Roosevelt's administration, in fact, which proposed putting a dam on the river to stop tidal pollution from its lower reaches. Fifty years ago, the idea of making a recreation area of the 15-mile stretch between Oradell and Teaneck was brought up, revived in 1935 and then revived again this year. But no action—or money—ever went with any of these schemes. This was one reason Troop 127 decided to see whether something couldn't be done on the community level. The mass assault came close, now and then to adding to the river's debris. Nancy Lippincott, for instance nearly left her boots behind when she became stuck on the bottom. Friends dragged her out, and the boots came too.

I congratulate Girl Scout Troop 127 of River Edge, N.J., and the other members of the community who cooperated with them in an immediate clean up of our environment.

LION "BIG MIKE" NUZZI—A MAN FOR ALL REASONS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Lions of New York State—and I am proud to be one—met last week at the Pines Hotel in Fallsburg, N.Y., for the annual convention during which they renew their dedication of more than half a century to the Lions' motto—"We Serve."

These community leaders, as part of Lions International, a worldwide service organization that numbers a million strong, are pledged to fellowship and service through autonomous Lions Clubs—each helping its own community in its own special fashion and all united in many larger enterprises for good, in Lion districts, guided by outstanding Lions who seek a wider service in Lionism as district governors.

Happily for my own Lion district, District 20 K-2, our Lion delegates at Fallsburg have chosen as their district governor for 1970-71, the first year of the new Lion decade, Lion Michael J. Nuzzi of the New Hyde Park Lions Club, a man who I claim proudly as both my constituent and my leader in Lionism for the coming year.

Lion "Big Mike" Nuzzi, as he is affectionately known, is the enthusiastic, gigantic embodiment of the Lion virtues of charity, patriotism, and community service. His New Hyde Park Lions Club reflects his qualities and has earned the honor of being the No. 1 Lions Club in our district. This is hardly surprising when we realize that in 15 years of Lion membership, Lion Mike has sponsored 21 lions, including nine past presidents and the present-elect for 1970-71, into his club.

During his campaign for district governor, Lion Mike's supporters dubbed him "a man for all reasons," and the title is an apt one. Lion Mike Nuzzi is the devoted father of five children of his own—and the beloved "Uncle Mike" of every boy who plays Little League Baseball in New Hyde Park. He is a successful and reputable businessman, whose successful fuel oil business is founded on the American footings of family cooperation, hard work, and fair measure for a fair price. In 1969, he was named both "Man of the Year" by his fellow businessmen in the New Hyde Park Chamber of Commerce and "Citizen of the Year" by veterans' organizations, in tribute to his patriotism, his civic pride and his service to the youth who are truly the Nation's hope for the days and years ahead.

But it is as Lion Michael J. Nuzzi—my own district governor for the Lion year 1970-71—that I hail him today. I congratulate Lion District Governor "Big Mike" Nuzzi and I pledge him my wholehearted support during the year ahead.

QUINCY'S HEADSTART PROGRAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Quincy Project Headstart will celebrate its fifth birthday this June. The city led the way nationally in that it had a program for the cultural-economic deprived children 5 years before the Headstart program was organized by the Federal Government. Because of this previous successful experience, the program in Quincy literally had a head start on its own project. Many advantages accrued to the project and its sponsorship under the public school system has proven to be its greatest asset. Working in cooperation with the schools, the program had benefited from over 100 years of educational experience, know-how, excellent classrooms, and other physical equipment. Many other programs without comparable experience and facilities have not done as well.

Under the direction of William Sacadat, the first comprehensive curriculum guide for a Headstart program in the State was completed; in addition, a series of five teacher text-manuals also were compiled in the areas of psychology, art activities, language, music, and science. Mr. Sacadat's leadership has, indeed, been important to the success of the program.

Parental involvement in the Quincy program also has been outstanding. For example, "Headstart Cook Book" was published. Tested recipes were contributed by mothers, who also did the editing and compiling. The parent advisory board has repeatedly shown that they are an integral part of the program by assisting in the decisionmaking in many areas. Mothers are regularly volunteering to work in the classrooms and to chaperone on field trips. A mothers club has been organized that has enjoyed programs and demonstrations on nutrition, sewing,

self-defense—karate—reducing, and professional lectures on art.

The Quincy program began standardized testing of its pupils in 1967 and is currently completing a research and followup on its students for the past 3 years. All indications point to a very substantial increase in test scores, academic achievements, and successes in school. Kindergarten teachers have repeatedly praised the Headstart program along with parents of children who have had the benefit of Headstart. In addition, the University of Chicago conducted a year-long study and observation of the Quincy project. Dr. Merle Carnes of the University of Illinois conducted a 2-day workshop and study in Quincy. The University of Southern Illinois sent its regional training officer to view the project. All have commended the program as one of the finest they have seen.

Because of the high caliber of the program and because of its continued interest in the welfare of the children, I wish to offer my congratulations and my best wishes for a happy fifth birthday to Quincy, Ill., Project Headstart.

HOUSING RIGHTS ACT OF 1970

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Housing Rights Act of 1970 which is aimed at bringing housing construction into the 1970's.

It has been demonstrated that horse and buggy housing construction methods cannot meet the burgeoning demands of this decade. We face the need for 26 million homes during the 1970's. We cannot continue to use the techniques of the 1930's to build housing during the 1970's. We cannot allow the restrictions of the past to stop us from reaching our goals for the future.

The legislation I am introducing will insure that when Federal dollars are used to back the building of houses, no barriers to efficient construction methods will be raised by local building codes, or by restrictive contracts negotiated by labor groups.

Essentially, it would extend Operation Breakthrough to the national level. We have seen that when the design capabilities and the technological skills of America's industries are applied to the housing field, they produce results. The use of modular housing, or prefab units, presents us with the opportunity to reach our ambitious housing goals. But the way must be cleared so that we can apply the latest technology and build the millions of new dwelling units needed to house our growing population.

My bill provides that—

Any provision or requirement in building codes or other local law or ordinance, or in any contract or agreement, which restricts the use of new or improved techniques, methods or materials or of preassembled products in connection with the construction or major rehabilitation of federally assisted housing shall be invalid with respect to such housing except where such restriction is deemed necessary to assure safe and health-

ful working or living conditions: Provided, that any such technique, method, material or product shall, for the purpose of this section, be judged as to safety and health under the same standards as otherwise applicable provisions of law, ordinance, contract or agreement apply to permitted techniques, methods, materials or products, either expressly or by common practice.

This section contains safeguards which will make certain that new technology is practical and will provide good, safe housing. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be authorized to test, or have tested, new materials and methods, to compare them with present techniques and to judge their comparability.

If we are to meet a national housing goal, we must have equal and fair building regulations across the country. If the taxpayers are going to foot the bill, they should rightfully expect the benefits of new housing technology to be available in all sections of the Nation.

Much progress has been made on the labor front. Due to the unique nature of the housing industry there have been many localized contracts, some of which have been restrictive and designed to keep out any semblance of modernity in housebuilding methods. Secretary Romney of HUD has made a major breakthrough in his pilot projects at HUD and has reached agreement with several unions on the modular-housing concept.

The 18 building trades unions have a vast stake in the future of America's housing industry. The market is there. The demand is evident. The assurance of volume is obvious. Large scale construction of modular housing will provide a new industry employing thousands of workers. Much of the seasonal aspect of today's housing industry will be eliminated by the construction in factories of housing sections. There will still be considerable onsite labor required. Overall, labor has a lot to gain by encouraging the construction of 26 million housing units during this decade. The sharp cutbacks in homebuilding over the past 5 years are a danger signal that the old ways do not fit today's market.

The financial facts of life are that the old concept of house and lot has become a fiscal impossibility for many families today. Using the rule of thumb that housing should cost 2½ times annual income, the \$8,000 wage earner finds today's residential prices out of reach. The answer is to provide housing that is within his income bracket. The fact that nearly a half-million mobile homes are being built each year indicates that there is a demand for reasonably priced, modern and convenient housing.

It is only realistic to anticipate that the local barriers to house construction cannot be broken down simply by edict. My bill provides recourse by the Government, or by local builders, through the courts. It provides that the Attorney General of the United States, after consultation with the Secretary of HUD or other appropriate Federal officials, can file a civil suit in U.S. district court, if it is believed that codes or contracts violate the intent of this law, to obtain equitable or preventive relief, or for damages. It is hoped that this section will not have to be widely used, but it should

be included for the protection of the taxpayers and to facilitate moving ahead on the housing front.

This measure is proposed not as being restrictive, but with the intent of opening the door to an all-out offensive against our housing shortage. I am hopeful that it will receive prompt and favorable committee consideration, and that the Congress will pass it so we can get on with the job. We must turn on the green light for housing in this country.

RIGHT TO DISSENT PROVIDES NEITHER THE RIGHT TO DESTROY PROPERTY NOR THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the backlash from many responsible citizens to the actions of some students, professors, and administrators of colleges and universities across this Nation may have a very grave effect on the future of higher education. It is obvious that millions of taxpayers in this country are bitter over the destruction and violence on the campuses and the widespread arbitrary closing of many schools.

It is my understanding that the letters I have been receiving on this subject are quite the same as those coming into the offices of my colleagues. Even folks who had contributed financially to colleges and universities in the past tell me that they will no longer make any type of contribution—or at least until the colleges and universities get back to some normal type of operation.

Perhaps one of the most widely circulated letters comes from a civil engineer who says:

We, as taxpayers, are responsible for paying the salaries of school teachers and for the operation of buildings. More than 30% of the Illinois state budget is used to operate the universities. Should we not be incensed that an organized minority can shut down major institutions of learning while the administrators cower in fear or even support anarchy to varying degrees?

Remember that we are paying for the operations of universities which are closed or have been closed. We are paying the salaries of staff members who are no longer teaching students. What is their right to a paid vacation during the time designated as part of the regular school year at our expense? We are paying for the National Guard and for police protection, much above the budgeted items and we are paying higher insurance rates as a result of vandalism. We are paying for buildings on and off campuses that have been destroyed by students, and it is not their property to destroy.

Many parents and students are paying fees for an education which they can no longer expect to receive under present campus conditions caused by the organized student activists.

The writer of this letter goes on to request that everyone send a letter to at least five other people using the chain letter principle to bring the situation to the attention of those who are going to be faced with paying the bills through the heavy taxes paid for institu-

tions of higher learning at both a State and Federal level and even on a voluntary basis in many instances. The writer closes by saying:

We must stand up and be counted now, if we are to retain a decent education system.

He points out that—

Laws made in the streets are likely to be administered in the gutter.

I do not believe that most citizens feel any differently about the right of dissent than I do. It is a right that is as basic as the freedom of this Nation itself. It is certainly a freedom which countless thousands of Americans have given their lives to preserve in past wars. But no citizen has the right to resort to violence nor infringe upon the constitutional or civil rights of another in the pursuit of his own particular beliefs.

If this is not a cardinal principle which is recognized at the university and college level where people are presumed to be intellectually advanced and prone to reason, what hope is there for retaining a system of law and order in this country? Unless this basic fact of life is recognized by those who are charged with the responsibility of running the institutions as custodians for the majority who provide the financial support, it will not take very long to destroy higher education in these United States.

PESTICIDE KILLING NATION'S SYMBOL

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am entering the following United Press International article into the RECORD as yet another indication of the threat which hard pesticides such as DDT and dieldrin pose to American wildlife:

PESTICIDE KILLING NATION'S SYMBOL

A widely used pesticide is contributing to the decline in the population of the bald eagle, the national bird which already is considered an endangered species in 48 states.

Interior Department scientists say they have detected poisoning from dieldrin in growing numbers of bald eagles found dead in the United States.

They said that, perhaps more importantly, dieldrin and other environmental pollutants may affect the eagle population by reducing the bird's reproduction capability.

Dr. Lucille Stickel, pesticide research coordinator at the Interior Department's Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, said dieldrin is widely used in all parts of the nation by farmers and in woolen mills to treat fabrics against moths.

Residues from the pesticide apparently drain into streams and lakes, where some of them accumulate in the bodies of fish, which make up the bulk of the eagles' diet, she said.

In 1968, the last day for which research results of tests at Patuxent have been completed, seven of 26 bald eagles examined had high levels of dieldrin in the brain. Dieldrin was "the only apparent cause of death" in five, said Charles W. Meacham, commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The five victims came from Florida, Wisconsin, Maryland, Missouri and South Carolina.

HOW MUCH DOES OUR FLAG COST?

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Walter J. Kaiser, Jr., the Americanism chairman of American Legion Post 980, the Hollis-Bellaire-Mark Post in Queens Village, N.Y., has written an article redolent with the aura of deeply felt patriotism. His moving words describe what the American flag costs—what it costs not in terms of dollars and cents, but in terms of blood and bravery and loss of life. His splendid essay expresses the emotion most of us feel for what the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, the distinguished former minority leader of the Senate, used to call gallant men and gallant deeds.

The sight of the American flag waving in the breeze is a thrilling sight. To be sure, there are quarrels among us as to where it should fly and what policies it should symbolize. Yet, most of us believe that, at hours of maximum peril to our country the flag is a vibrant national symbol which unites us all, bringing us to a common accord in defense of our country.

Therefore, it is important that Mr. Kaiser has spoken in praise of our flag at this time of peril for the cause of freedom, when our country is threatened all around the world and here at home as well.

The American flag, which unites us all, has never been a more irreplaceable symbol than it is today. We need to see it beating in the breeze just as we need to feel the beat of our hearts. And we need to pledge allegiance—to the flag, to the country for which it stands, one Nation ultimately indivisible, despite the discord which has recently afflicted us.

Mr. Kaiser's inspiring essay follows:

How Much Does Our Flag Cost?

(By Walter J. Kaiser, Jr.)

As the Americanism Chairman of an American Legion Post, I have been asked many times, during our American Flag campaigns, one outstanding question, "How much does our Flag cost?" I have always answered this question in terms of dollars and cents, but this answer never seemed to reflect the real price, the true price, that so many Americans, and too many Americans have paid for our Flag.

To find the real answer, I believe we would have to go back many many years, to many many wars, to many many battlefields. Back there, on those bloodstained battlefields, we could ask the crippled, the blind, the dying and the dead. We could ask them "How much does our Flag cost?"

Back there, we could ask the Patriots at the Boston Tea Party, the Minutemen at Concord, the frost-bitten soldiers at Valley Forge, and the weary and the hungry fighting men at Gettysburg. We could ask all the great Presidents and all the great Generals, who constantly saw through tear-dimmed eyes, ever present death and destruction. I think they could tell us how much our Flag costs.

We could ask the heroes at Chateau Thierry, the gallant sailors, buried on the Arizona at Pearl Harbor, the marines at Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal, the stretcher bearers at Anzio Beach. We could ask all those who landed at Normandy, and those who fought

in the Battle of the Bulge. They could probably tell us how much our Flag costs.

There is a possibility that we would not have to go to such extremes to find the real answer, we could probably find it right here at home. We could visit the numerous veterans, who lay on their sick beds, at the various Veterans' hospitals throughout the country, and there we could ask the armless, the legless, the mentally ill, the diseased and the shell-shocked. We probably wouldn't have to ask, because, we would surely see the price they paid for our Flag.

There is even a further possibility that we could find the answer right in our own neighborhood. We could ask the Gold Star mothers, who lost their only sons, the wives who lost their husbands, the children who lost their fathers or their brothers, and all those who lost their sweethearts. I believe that if you were to ask them, they would say they paid for our Flag, with loneliness and sorrow; heartache and tears; sacrifice and suffering; and heartbreak and despair.

Today and everyday as you see our Flag flying ever so proudly, try to give it a long lingering look, and deep in your hearts, try to realize just what it symbolizes. The White and Red stripes symbolize the purity of purpose for which our comrades shed their blood. The White Stars in the field of Blue symbolize that the heights of pure democracy can reach to the very stars in the heavens.

Our Flag could be made from a flimsy piece of printed cotton, or it could be made into a banner of beautiful silk. The intrinsic value could be very great, or it could be very small, but its real value, its true value, is the precious symbol we all work for, live for, and perhaps someday die for. It is the symbol of a free Nation, of free men, true to the faiths of the past, and dedicated to the principles of Freedom, Justice and Democracy.

For just a moment, I wish you would bow your head and in the concept of your own belief, say a silent prayer, thanking God that the colors of our Flag are still Red, White and Blue, and pray that our boys in Vietnam, and those who are stationed all over this world will do everything they can to keep it that way.

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICIALS OPPOSE THE WAR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the slogan, "War is unhealthy for children and other living things." Nothing could be more true, so it is not surprising that an organization of public health officials should take a position against the war, as the Northern California Public Health Association has done. What is worthy of note is the unanimity with which the association acted at its May 22 annual meeting. The resolution below, adopted by more than 90 percent of the members present and signed by 159 northern California public health officials, conforms precisely to my own beliefs:

The Northern California Public Health Association, dedicated as it is to the health of all peoples, vigorously condemns U.S. Military involvement in Southeast Asia and calls for withdrawal of our forces there.

There is a critical need to redirect our nation's overseas war energies and expenditures to finish our domestic wars against ill health, poverty and discrimination.

CONCERNED ABOUT EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as you may well know, I have been intensely interested in legislation to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 which was enacted as title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is an act which, as a lawyer, I find replete with constitutional infirmities and, as a member of a minority group in this country, I find totally repugnant.

As some of my colleagues are aware, the President can devolve the far-reaching powers of the act onto his Attorney General by his self-determined finding that an "insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy" is occurring. And, once the powers of the act have been invoked, a whole series of constitutional problems arise. While this law has never been invoked, the President could make the decision tomorrow if he wished; there are no standards to which he is accountable; there are no safeguards against arbitrary action. Furthermore, there is evidence to support the notion that this is no idle question.

While you can imagine the fear that is already rising that this law might be invoked to the detriment of the nonwhite groups of this country, Mr. Speaker, you might not realize that other minority groups feel the same way. I, therefore, would like to submit for the RECORD the following copy of a letter from the director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to the chairman of the House Internal Security Committee:

ANTI-DEFACTION LEAGUE

OF B'NAI B'RITH,

Washington, D.C., April 24, 1970.

HON. RICHARD H. ICEBERG,
Chairman, House Committee on Internal Security,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your recent letter inviting our views on the bills pending before the House Committee on Internal Security to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 which was enacted as Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Earlier this year we joined with other national and local Jewish organizations in urging the Congress to repeal Title II. We said at that time that Title II is "thoroughly repugnant to American tradition. Our national security is amply protected by the laws that punish espionage and sabotage through conventional, constitutional criminal proceedings." A copy of that statement has been forwarded to the Committee.

At this time we reaffirm our support for repeal of Title II and urge prompt action by your Committee and the House to join the Senate which has already passed such legislation, S. 872. The fact that a bipartisan group of some 135 House members has introduced repealer bills is an indication of the widespread support both in and out of the Congress for repeal of Title II. Although the law has never been invoked and there are now no plans to use it, "unfortunately," as Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst wrote the Senate Judiciary Committee in December, "the legislation has aroused among many of the citizens of the United

States the belief that it may one day be used to accomplish the apprehension and detention of citizens who hold unpopular beliefs and views." Repeal of the Act, as Mr. Kleindienst said, will allay these unfounded fears and suspicions. "This benefit outweighs any potential advantage which the Act may provide in a time of internal security emergency."

We concur in these views. Title II has no place on our statute books. As former Chief Justice Warren recently said, it is not in the American tradition. There are now adequate laws on our books to protect our country against espionage, sabotage and subversion without the need to resort to the totalitarian concepts underlying Title II. We, therefore, urge your Committee to recommend repeal of the Act to the House.

We respectfully request that this letter be included in the printed record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. BRODY.

THE DECISIVE DECADE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I was the principal speaker at the commencement exercises for Southwick High School's class of 1970 at Southwick, Mass.

At that very fine affair the salutatory was delivered by Rene R. Bouchard, a graduating senior who chose to speak on "The Decisive Decade." His remarks concerned the tumultuous decade of the 1960's and were extraordinary in that they took full note of both the good and bad of that time period.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when so much public opinion in this Nation is polarized at the extremes, it was refreshing to hear a young American stand before his peers and his elders and deliver an address of force and balance.

His words were optimistic, not plaintive; hope, not despair was his message. Optimism and hope traditionally have been the weapons of the young against a world that at times seems hostile. These are fine tools indeed, and I hope they are held by many of Rene Bouchard's contemporaries.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert his remarks in the RECORD:

THE DECISIVE DECADE

Doctor Tolley, Reverend Flahive, Congressman Conte, Superintendent Weeks, School Committee Chairman Putnam, Mr. Prew, Members of the Faculty, Fellow Graduates, Ladies and Gentlemen: Welcome to the graduation exercises of Southwick High School's class of 1970.

The theme of these exercises this evening is "A Look at Our Times."

Tonight, I shall speak about the lessons of history in "The Decisive Decade", January, 1960 through December 1969.

In the sixties, America became involved in Vietnam, pulled its troops out of France, developed serious talks with the Soviet Union, and witnessed growing unrest at home. Although these events are now recent history, they should teach us a lesson about history. George Santayana said it to an earlier generation: "A nation that does not know its history is fated to repeat it."

The sixties was a time of dissent and demonstration, of nonviolence followed by violent rebellion of young people and minority groups who were dissatisfied with the status quo. But even though we had riots, strikes and rebellion, we did not have a complete revolt.

Some say that demonstrations show a decay in our country. I do not agree. I believe that they are a healthy sign. They show concern for the problems of this country. The riots in Watts and other cities, and the demonstrations in Chicago and on the campuses focused attention on equal Civil Rights and equal justice for all Americans. The people are listening to the lessons of history. My generation is concerned and will continue making social reforms. Today, our problem is how to implement the civil rights laws.

The most striking events of the sixties had a profound effect on the world situation: the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, the Korean Ship Dilemma, the Arab-Israeli War, and the crises in Latin America.

Look, if you will, at the problem of violence. The late Mahatma Gandhi showed how to get changes by peaceful nonviolent resistance. His example of nonviolent rebellion spread to the United States during the sixties and was used successfully by the followers of Martin Luther King. Yet, January of 1961 saw a young President Kennedy in office, then—dead—in two years. In the years following, political assassinations became common: in America, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and Robert Kennedy; in Africa, Mboya and Balewa. These killings proved the instability of political life throughout the world. America and the world were not as secure as we had been led to believe. Yes, violence increased in many ways in the sixties—hi-jackings, bombings, riots,—and with these—a disrespect for the law.

On the positive side of the decisive decade, we Americans saw the successful advancement of our space research program. We won the "long-dreamed-of" race for the moon . . . in July, 1969! After billions of dollars and thousands of man hours, we made it, we were the first to land on the moon. For what? Back on earth, the poor of Appalachia, Nigeria, India, Asia and South America were starving! When does our moral duty to feed these people stop? It should stop only when we have no more to give. All the moon rocks and dust in outer space are not worth the lives of millions of starving human beings here on earth. The lessons . . . learned from the moon . . . were they worth the price?

Our parents' generation has made significant contributions in improving our standard of living. They have given us Salk and his polio vaccine, Fleming and the miracle drug—penicillin, and recently, Christian Barnard and the heart transplant. Electronics and computers, to mention only two, are developing our knowledge and technology every day. We must use these medical and technical advances to feed and educate the poor and underprivileged wherever they live.

In this Spring of 1970, we appear to be a divided country, divided on many different issues—but mostly—divided on the war, racial justice, and the generation gap. These issues are tearing our country apart. Let us learn a lesson from history: division can make a nation useless. We must unite . . . our purposes and our goals. Unity is the challenge of the seventies. And violence never gets its intended goals.

Too many people go through life content . . . happy with their own little plot of mediocrity. This is not for me. I can't stand a constant pace of life, over and over, each day. Life must be full of change, and, with it, conflict, and with it, improvement. Life must have meaning. For me, I have found deep meaning in my religion and I hope to help others . . . as a Passionist priest. My goal is to work with teenagers, for they hold

the hopes and ideals of the human race. I want to help them find meaning in their lives. This is a challenging yet difficult task. But, you don't have to become a priest to do this. There is a need for teachers, social workers, Peace Corps workers, VISTA volunteers; and there is a need for good parents to help their children find meaning in life.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a young man of the decisive decade in America looked forward to the sixties with an air of hope, stated it clearly for then and now, in his Inaugural Address: "All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days. . . . Nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

THE LIBRARY OF PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Presidential Papers, a private institution chartered by the board of regents of the State of New York, is providing valuable services of citizenship education. This includes the distribution of historical documents, together with introductory essays related thereto, to high schools and colleges throughout the United States.

The Library, which has as its chairman, Mr. Arthur T. Roth, former chairman of the board of the Franklin National Bank, and as its president and chief executive officer, Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, former chancellor of Long Island University, conducted on April 3-5, 1970, at Montauk, Long Island, N.Y., a notable symposium on the Office of the President of the United States. Senior White House staff members, for all presidential administrations, from President Hoover through President Nixon, participated in this unique gathering, with more than 100 business, professional, and labor leaders, from throughout the United States.

Equally inspiring, is the constructive volunteer work of college students at the Library. They are now planning the first symposium on the Office of the President of the United States for college students. This will be convened in the fall of 1970 with representatives from more than 100 colleges. Among the student volunteers who are planning this symposium are: Miss Bernadette Casey, Mr. Daniel Henry Frank, and Mr. Walter Konrady, all of the C. W. Post Center, Long Island University, Greenvale, N.Y.; Mr. Mark A. Pfeiffer, a senior honor student at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.; and Mrs. Dee Workman Kirbow, a young alumna of Columbia College in Columbia, S.C.

In recently volunteering their services, these young people wrote the following statement of purpose:

The Library of Presidential Papers recognizes the important role of contemporary youth in developing a center for the study of the highest public office in the land. We believe that there is both an opportunity and a need to build bridges of understanding between the youth of America and the Office of the President of the United States.

We propose the National Youth Conference on the Presidency as an instrument in that bridge building, and with constructive examination of the critical problems we face.

Mr. Daniel Henry Frank, who is a resident of Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., wrote the following mandate for this national youth conference:

The '60's will go down in history as the decade when youth assumed an especial role on the American scene. In essence, young people of America have grown in stature and ability. They relate to significant issues of our time. To communicate and serve effectively they need a more complete understanding of the Office of the President of the United States. They must better understand the views of the President on the critical problems we face. And the President, in turn, must be aware of how these relationships appear to them. President Nixon recognized this crucial juncture upon chartering the upcoming 1970 White House Conference on Youth and Children, an event which will seek ways to make more meaningful the role of youth of the '70's in society.

The United Nations is embarking upon its first World Youth Assembly.

But despite these best efforts in the public sector, there is a role in the private sector of building these bridges of understanding. It is our contention that an arduous task in communications lies ahead for the purposes of relating the youth with the Office of the President of the United States. We believe that the Library of Presidential Papers can, in large measure, fulfill the obligations and duties of the private sector through its forthcoming National Youth Conference on the Presidency. This creative undertaking will bring together responsible student leaders from colleges throughout the nation meeting with responsible senior leaders who are serving in, or have served with the Office of the President. Through this interchange, we can and will build respect based upon understanding.

Such constructive work of our college students is worthy of support. The Library of Presidential Papers, by inspiring such services, is contributing much to our institutional values, and understanding.

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN WRITES
HER CONGRESSMAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I have received from an individual I have known well over a period of years. I think that Mrs. Norman Anderson of College Station, Tex., is the average American citizen, loyal, true, and patriotic and very concerned about what is happening to her country, my country, our country. Her letter is typical of many I receive and I want others to read what she has to say:

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am again enclosing clippings from the Dallas News which readers have written that in a large measure express my views.

We have coddled and cowered—almost glorified anything young or youthful until now they expect what they want anytime, anywhere and now. Who are they to tell the College Presidents how to run the college;

or Mr. Nixon what his foreign policy is to be now—this week?

I am opposed to 18 year olds voting. Many are still in high school, do not own property, haven't got responsibility, are too easily swayed by emotion, aren't now being drafted. Maybe the voting age should be lowered, but not to 18. I think a hard core of young communists trained for trouble are our leaders here. As a taxpayer, I resent closing colleges and losing education time constantly.

I am appalled at the action of the liberal clique in the Senate who would defeat us in the Asian conflict by denying funds to the President. They are asking that we give up everything we fought for and insulting the President. What he did in Cambodia was necessary.

I don't understand the liberals who seem to believe that capitulating to the communists works. Why should the communists negotiate in Paris? The Senate is trying to give them the victory.

And I don't understand why some are afraid to build our defenses against Russia for fear that she will be offended? We must stay strong and superior to Russia or we will be ruined. While we observe our agreements, they break them and forge ahead. This time they intend to be well ahead before they pretend to agree. I think our country is in grave danger—due in great part to Mr. Fulbright, Kennedy, Church, Hatfield, and Goodell.

I have lost trust in Congress—they talk but they don't act against a union or individuals who break the law (strike of the Postal workers) for example. The men who struck and hurt others financially in many ways received rewards just as those who stayed on and the law was specific in their case. No one suggested punitive action—What does this do to law and order? The ordinary taxpayer is getting very frustrated.

I resent the so-called objective treatment of issues by television. They are slanted against the administration and conservatives and glorify youth—even the commercials do.

I am sure your job is discouraging at times.

Cordially,

Mrs. NORMAN ANDERSON.

IN SUPPORT OF THE 18-YEAR-OLD
VOTE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the 18-year-old vote turns not on whether they should have it but on how this should be accomplished. There is wide agreement in Congress and in the administration that 18-year-olds should have the vote. The following letter to the editor of the Washington Post from officers of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights presents a cogent argument for doing it by act of Congress and leaving it to the Supreme Court to establish the constitutionality of the law, the letter follows:

DEAR SIR: Much has been written in recent days by the Washington Post and by others concerning the constitutionality of the Senate-passed bill to lower the voting age to 18 years. Since this issue of constitutionality will confront the House of Representatives very shortly, it would appear appropriate to set forth the position of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights thereon and to respond briefly to what seem to us essentially "academic" arguments.

When distinguished law professors differ on the question of the constitutionality of a law as here (Harvard's Paul Freund and Archibald Cox *pro* and Yale's Louis Pollak and Alexander Bickel *con*), it is apparent that scholarship is not going to resolve the issue. What is at stake, rather, is the future evolution of the equal protection clause as part of a living Constitution. It should be obvious that only the Supreme Court of the United States will chart this future course and that no one can predict with absolute certainty what this course will be. Many considerations, however, lead us to conclude that Congress should lower the voting age to 18 and leave the Supreme Court to determine the constitutionality of its action.

The framers of the Civil War Amendments looked primarily to Congress to enforce the rights guaranteed by them. Except for the legislation passed during the Reconstruction period, however, Congress abdicated this responsibility until it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1957. In the intervening period, it became the Supreme Court's task to enforce the right to vote, to equal protection and to due process. All this time the Supreme Court itself hoped that the Congress would begin to share its burden.

It is in this context that the Supreme Court's decision in *Katzenbach v. Morgan* must be evaluated. Acknowledging the full authority which the fifth section of the Fourteenth Amendment gives to Congress to enforce the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court held that Congress could compel states to act in a manner which the Court could not decree in the absence of Congressional legislation:

We think it is most hazardous for anyone to conclude that after welcoming the participation of Congress to what, at long last, has become a common congressional, judicial and executive enterprise to enforce the guarantees of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, the Court will hold unconstitutional a considered effort of Congress to assure millions of 18-year olds an equal right to vote.

The fact that the second section of the Fourteenth Amendment, which became effective in 1868, authorizes the reduction of Congressional representation of any state which denies the right to vote to male citizens 21 and over does not imply that the Court must rule that lowering the voting age to 18 is an inappropriate way to enforce the equal protection guarantee. The judgment with respect to the proper age for voting should be left to Congress and its notions of propriety and equality may reasonably be subject to change as time goes by.

There is no longer any rational opposition to 18-year old voting. The Senate adopted that provision by a vote of 64 to 17. The Nixon Administration supports 18-year old voting, arguing only that it should be accomplished by constitutional amendment rather than statute. The importance of bringing college-age men and women into the political arena is now generally accepted in the halls of Congress.

In this view, one might suggest the overwhelming probability that the Supreme Court will uphold the action of Congress if it enacts the Senate bill. The Court is, above all, a pragmatic institution. Under President Roosevelt it shifted from outlawing New Deal measures to validating them in the interest of national recovery. Under President Eisenhower it reversed an ancient segregation decision to fit the needs of the times. One finds it hard to believe that the Court would add to the existing divisiveness of the nation by taking away from the young people of the nation the right to vote after the right had been granted by Congress.

Constitutional arguments there will continue to be on both sides. But the practical answer will come from a Court which understands that the future of America lies at the

ballot box rather than on the campuses and in the streets and that a Congressional decision to utilize the equal protection clause to this end should be hospitably received.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
General Counsel.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Legislative Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

THE TIME IS NOW

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a very thought-stirring letter which appeared in the Washington Daily News.

I am not given to pessimism concerning the future of this great Nation. On the contrary, I have deep faith in our country, in the intrinsic soundness, commonsense, and courage of the American people.

And I believe that, notwithstanding the distressing emotional upset, confusion, and unrest of our times, this country when put to the test and aroused to the threats and dangers that confront us, will rally to the cause of ordered freedom, solve these problems and repudiate the determined, well-organized enemies outside and inside our gates.

Courage, prompt and determined action, sound judgments, and an awakened sense of our posture, our future, and what must be done under the Constitution and the law to protect and preserve our great, unequalled heritage are required without further delay.

This must be the daily job of every American—the urgent duty of all those who are intent upon the present and future preservation of this great, free country. There is no time to lose.

Let us reassert our confidence in the future growing greatness of this nation, and mobilize our resources and our energies to the defense of our liberties, the building of our standards and the forward march of our institutions and the people.

The letter referred to, follows:

TIMETABLE TO REMEMBER

One of the most widely read books of all times is *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, written by Edward Gibbon in 1788. He set forth five basic reasons why that great civilization withered and died. These were:

1. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home, which is the basis for the human society.
2. High and higher taxes, the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the populace.
3. The mad craze for pleasure; sports becoming every year more exciting, more brutal, more immoral.
4. The building of great armaments when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual responsibility.
5. The decay of religion; faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life, losing power to guide the people.

The average age of the world's civilizations has been 200 years. These nations rose and fell in the following sequence:

From Bondage to Spiritual Faith.

From Spiritual Faith to Great Courage.

From Courage to Liberty.
From Liberty to Abundance.
From Abundance to Selfishness.
From Selfishness to Complacency.
From Complacency to Apathy.
From Apathy to Dependence.
From Dependence back to Bondage.

In 14 years the United States will be 200 years old. This cycle is not inevitable. It depends on you.

WENDALL A. PARRIS.

PALME—THE "CURIOUS YELLOW" PRIME MINISTER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Olaf Palme, the Socialist Prime Minister of Sweden and that country's leading American bairer, paid a little-noticed visit to Washington this week.

While he addressed a women's club on "The Emancipation of Man," his topic was aimed at forced equality of the sexes by destruction of any predetermined roles on account of sex.

In fact, the Crown Prince of Sweden would have us believe that in his country it is regarded unnatural for a woman to have a different role than the man, or to devote more time to children.

Yet, the great emancipator and apologist for the Communist murderers of American men in Vietnam, was only concerned about our morals should we have a military victory in Southeast Asia.

As I have earlier commented, we have many wonderful Swedish Americans in the United States and I am sure that there are many Swedes in Sweden who are pro-American, but among them is not their "Curious Yellow" Prime Minister Palme.

I insert a clipping from a local paper at this point:

[From the Evening Star, June 9, 1970]

VICTORY OR DEFEAT?

(By Joy Billington)

The prime Minister of Sweden, Olaf Palme, here on a private visit designed to repair fractured U.S.-Swedish relations, was asked questions about Cambodia, the treatment of the U.S. ambassador in Sweden, the longshoremen protest against him at Kenyon College, Ohio, last week, and his appearance in the film "I Am Curious (Yellow)"—when he was guest speaker at the Woman's National Democratic Club yesterday.

This was after his prepared address, "The Emancipation of Man."

Emphasizing that he did not wish to "abuse hospitality" or intervene in national affairs, Palme nevertheless expressed what he described as his honest reaction to the news of President Nixon's "invasion" of Cambodia.

"When I received the news, I felt that even if it were a military victory, it would be a moral defeat for the U.S."

This was for two reasons, Palme explained. It meant an extension of the war. It meant that "a great power went into a small nation without the explicit request and consent of the government of the country in question."

In protesting such action, Palme said, "we are really only asserting our own right to exist, as a small country."

American deserters given sanctuary in Sweden, he said are in a long tradition of men fleeing from many wars.

"We have not encouraged them," he emphasized.

Some of them are quiet and adjust to Swedish life, he said. Some of them are active, "and call me a lackey of Nixon." Others are drug addicts who are in trouble with the law there for criminal offenses connected with drugs.

Their presence, however, is a reflection of Sweden's traditional laws protecting the individual. "The U.S. has the same laws. If the situation were reversed, our people would benefit in the same way by your laws."

Asked by a questioner about the treatment of the U.S. Ambassador Jerome Holland, whether there was any racism, Palme said that being a Negro would make Holland more popular with Swedes. The vast majority of Swedes are pro-American, he insisted. They are also anti-war, but they still wish to maintain good relations. Only a tiny minority have behaved badly, the Prime Minister said.

Concerning the demonstration against him and his country on Saturday at Kenyon College, Ohio, Palme said he was sad to see that many of the protestors did not know much about the slogans written on their signs.

"And they didn't want to listen, just to howl. They didn't hear that I was actually making a speech about the equal distribution of wealth and the need for strong unions," he said with irony. "They looked very angrily at the Reverend who was to give the invocation, because he looked much more prime ministerial than me."

PIXIELIKE

The pixielike Swede, asked about "I Am Curious (Yellow)" in which he appears in a documentary sequence (being interviewed as the Minister of Communications he then was) said he was "conned" into it by the director.

"I haven't seen it. I'm not curious enough. The director didn't tell me he was doing his documentary on another area of human endeavor!"

His major address, delivered to a room packed with women, including his wife Lisbeth and his press secretary, Berit Rollen, a woman, was a serious explanation of developments in Sweden towards freeing men and women from their traditional sex roles.

"We have talked too long about the emancipation of women and the problem of woman's role in society. It is human beings we shall emancipate." The greatest gain of increased equality will be the end of predetermined roles on account of sex, he said.

At school and through TV, boys got an exaggerated picture "of what it means to be a man," tough, hardboiled, wild-west hero supermen and soldiers. "The boys compensate their lack of contact with kind, everyday men by looking upon mass media men as their ideal."

The new way to combat this in Sweden is for both parents to work part-time, or full-time with day-care facilities.

"If a politician today should declare that women ought to have a different role than the man, that it is 'natural' she devotes more time to children, he would be regarded as something out of the Stone Age."

REFORMING THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following two articles, by Norman C. Miller in

the Wall Street Journal of May 22, 1970, and Dave Secrest in the May 30, 1970, issue of Business Week, discuss the prospects for reforming the House seniority system:

REFORMING THE HOUSE SENIORITY SYSTEM
(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The retirement of 78-year-old Speaker John McCormack at the end of this year will remove the prime symbol of the Old Guard in the House of Representatives. But more than a change at the top will be necessary to alter the basic power structure in the tradition-bound House.

Reform of the hallowed seniority system will be necessary before fundamental change occurs. The real power in the House is held by the committee chairmen. And as long as their positions are protected by the rigid seniority custom, strong-willed chairmen can wield their power with little regard for the desires of their junior colleagues—or the Speaker, whoever he may be.

Thus, for years the Southern Democratic conservatives who control major House committees have blocked or created great difficulty for legislation the party's liberal majority professes to favor. Speaker McCormack, though he espoused an old-style liberalism, gladly allowed this anomalous situation because the Southerners helped elect him. And the heir apparent to the speakership, Carl Albert, could turn out to be equally weak in dealing with chairmen. The 62-year-old Oklahoman certainly has shown no eagerness as majority leader to upset the established system.

PRESSURE ON MR. ALBERT

Nonetheless, the prospective change in the Democratic leadership gives a powerful impetus to the heretofore low-keyed effort to reform the seniority system. As the front-runner for the speakership, Mr. Albert will come under extreme pressure from the reform-minded Democrats to accept their ideas. And for the No. 2 job of majority leader, the reformers have a good chance to elect one of their own. Liberal candidates James O'Hara of Michigan and Morris Udall of Arizona both say they want to make committee chairmen more responsive to the party majority.

Moreover, junior House Republicans are mounting a reform campaign of their own. The GOP leadership has already given its blessing to a study of the seniority issue by a party committee that's dominated by reform-minded members. The fact that reform forces are active in both parties creates a competitive climate in which meaningful reform becomes more likely.

To be sure, there's scant chance that either party will decide to junk completely the time-honored method of selecting chairmen solely on the basis of length of Congressional service; seniority doubtless would remain a factor in the selection of chairmen. Nor would one party's overhaul compel the other to follow suit. In both parties and in both houses of Congress, although the seniority system is only a custom and not a rule, it is deeply ingrained, and it will not be modified easily.

The inflexibility breeds bitterness among the invisible junior members in the 435-seat House. Third-term James Scheuer, a 50-year-old Democrat, voices the frustration of many in both parties:

"This Congress abounds in capable men in their 30s and 40s and 50s, but they are smothered by the dead hand of those born in the last century."

Indeed, nine of the House committee chairmen were born in the 1800s, and the average age of all 21 chairmen is 68, while the average age of all the House members is 52. This generation gap rankles the relative youngsters because the power of a committee chairman is enormous. He fosters or stifles legislation and investigations, and the final product frequently bears his name. He

is fawned on by the news media, and Presidents seek his counsel.

MR. WALDIE'S FRUSTRATION

The angry frustration of a 45-year-old Democrat, Jerome Waldie of California, finally brought the long-simmering seniority issue to a boil last February. Declaring his disgust with the "unresponsiveness" of House Democratic leaders, the audacious third-term urged the party caucus to vote a lack of confidence in Speaker McCormack, who was then professing determination to stay in office. The Waldie motion was resoundingly quashed, but the dramatic rebellion against the party's elderly leader spurred moderate reform forces into action.

Leaders of the Democratic Study Group, a loose alliance of more than 100 liberals, began pressing for establishment of a party committee to study the seniority issue. While the Democrats debated, junior Republicans persuaded their leaders to seize the initiative and appoint a study committee of their own. Under pressure, Democratic leaders then acquiesced in a seniority study too, and the party caucus gave its approval in March.

Thus the machinery for possible reform by the Democrats was cranked up well before the McCormack announcement. The party's 11-member study committee is broadly representative, from fiery freshman Shirley Chisholm of New York to a pillar of the House establishment, Olin Teague of Texas. The committee chairman, Julia Butler Hansen of Washington state, is widely respected, and she promises an "open-minded" study. Reform Democrats are confident that the committee will make its report in time for decisive action at the January caucus in which the new Congress will be organized.

But the reformers' high hopes hardly foreordain certain change, particularly so long as the Democrats control the House—as they have since 1955. The typical House Democrat has learned to live under the smothering hand of his elders, abjectly grateful for the crumbs they drop in the form of subcommittee chairmanships, meanwhile creeping up the seniority ladder; death or retirement will empty the committee chair eventually.

Southern Democrats benefit the most from seniority, acquiring a disproportionately high share of chairmanships because their one-party districts give them lifetime tenure. The Southerners will use all their considerable skills to maintain the power they have employed so often to thwart the Democratic liberal activists.

The Democratic Study Group, after analyzing votes on 30 key issues in the last Congress, has reported that nearly one-third of the committee chairmen voted more often with the Republicans than with their own party. Named as "opposition chairmen" were such strategically situated Southern Democrats as William Colmer of Rules, George Mahon of Appropriations, Wilbur Mills of Ways and Means and Mendel Rivers of Armed Services.

The Democrats' stake in the status quo, notwithstanding the rebels in their midst, makes some think the Republicans are the more likely reformers. The GOP's elders might well resist any proposals for change, but on the whole the House Republicans are more receptive to new procedures. The reason is basic: Almost half the Republican members have served only three terms or less and thus have no vested interest in seniority. (More than two-thirds of the Democrats have served four terms or more.)

A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

Republicans, moreover, see a potential campaign issue in seniority. Second-term Paul McCloskey of California, in a letter earlier this year to GOP House leaders, said that pledging Republicans to reforming the seniority system "would enable us to capitalize on the serious vulnerability of the Democratic leadership's age and unresponsiveness

to the problems of the '70s." The Democrats could still be vulnerable to such charges that they merely change leaders and don't change the system.

Just what form the change should take is an open question in both parties. The reformers agree only that they don't like strict seniority. Few would like to revert to the pre-1910 system of allowing the Speaker potentially dictatorial power to make committee assignments; nor do most members think it would be practical to let everyone compete for chairmanships, which could lead to chaotic electioneering and logrolling. Most reformers appear to favor something between strict seniority and these extreme alternatives.

At this point, the details are not as important as the change in climate. For the many House members no longer willing to wait on a system geared solely to longevity, a real opportunity has arisen at last to achieve reform.

[From Business Week magazine,
May 30, 1970]

GOVERNMENT—TAKING THE CREAKS OUT OF SENIORITY

"Even societies that worship their ancestors don't automatically put them in charge of their Armed Services Committees," protests freshman Republican Representative Allard K. Lowenstein (D-N.Y.).

Like Lowenstein, who is 41, the younger members of Congress have complained for years about the traditional seniority system that automatically elevates inept as well as capable legislators to power on the basis of sheer durability and a safe district. In a nation increasingly absorbed with the problems of youth and social change, the critics view the domination of Capitol Hill by elderly men with growing alarm.

While the retirement of 78-year-old House Speaker John W. McCormack may help assuage the criticism, it still leaves Congress with three committee chairmen over 80 and seven over 70. But, to nearly everybody's surprise, some changes may be in the making.

Both Democrats and Republicans have set up task forces to review seniority and make recommendations before the Congress next January. Nobody expects any revolutionary changes; in some form or other, the basic principle of seniority will be maintained. But even a partial breakdown would chip away at some of the fiefdoms that dominate Congress.

Power plays. With their chairmanships safe from almost any attack, senior members swing inordinate power. They can usually keep bills they do not like from getting any real hearing or can push through those they do like. Since committee members are beholden to the chairman for such favors as subcommittee chairmanships, they are unlikely to dissent on any but the most critical matters. Pressure groups that can keep a chairman in their camp usually have little to fear from a committee. The House Commerce Committee, for instance, rarely approves any legislation that the broadcasters oppose. The Public Works Committee responds far more readily to the highway lobby than to urban planners.

The seniority system is particularly grating in the House. The Senate, with virtually open rules, is already fairly free-wheeling; committee bills often are rewritten on the floor. In the House, though, the chairman may preside over a cozy little dominion. He is usually backed by the Speaker as a matter of principle—and there is little reason to expect Carl Albert of Oklahoma to buck the chairmen when he becomes Speaker any more than McCormack did. Committee bills sometimes go to the floor with no amendments permitted and debate strictly limited. Panels such as Armed Services and Appropriations, whose chairmen have enor-

mous power to affect projects in other members' districts, are seldom reversed by the House.

But the creation of the machinery for reform has now given the frustrated junior members reason to hope that change is on the way. The task forces can hardly report to their party caucuses that they find the system just dandy as it is. And both groups are headed by moderates known to favor some bending of the seniority line.

"We'll do something about seniority," says Representative Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash.), who heads the Democratic task force. Mrs. Hansen, who is 62, is hardly a rebel. In seven terms in Congress, she has never been a crusader for institutional reform. But a friend quotes her as feeling that "senility, secrecy, and seniority" are problems Congress must deal with.

The head of the GOP task force, Representative Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R-N.Y.), is one of the newer breed—47, a third-term, protégé of GOP leader Gerald Ford, and a hard-working member of Ways & Means. He senses "quite a bit of ferment" about the system, "and we don't have the hangups about preserving seniority that the Democrats have."

But the argument for reform is especially strong within Democratic liberal ranks. Seniority gives disproportionate power to Southern conservatives. Almost half the committee and subcommittee chairmanships are held by members from 14 Southern and border states. "Most chairmen are products of either the courthouse politics of the South or the machine politics of the North," complains Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.).

The system has its staunch defenders, of course. They cite, especially, the political favor-swapping that would enter into any system of electing chairmen. They assert that chairmen now can stand up without fear against the increasing powers of the Presidency. And seniority supposedly assures that a legislator will at least learn the subjects his committee deals with before he gets to be chairman.

Most people assume that the seniority system, entrenched as it is, must be rooted in the rules of Congress and difficult to overthrow. In fact, it has no authority other than tradition. Either party can abandon it by a majority vote of a full-party caucus and choose chairmen some other way.

OPTIONS

The task forces are studying a number of options. If they get to the heart of the matter, they will go for some procedure to permit either the committees or the party caucus to elect chairmen. Most suggestions would give the senior member first crack. If he were rejected, the slot would be open, with perhaps the next most senior member up for a shot at it.

The most reform-minded lawmakers prefer the full-party vote. Mrs. Hansen doubts the majority of Democrats would go that far, but she thinks they might opt for "some kind of ratification." This could mean that the party leaders, or some select committee, would nominate a new chairman if the senior member were turned down.

Other suggestions would simply put some limits on chairmen—rotating the job among a panel's top three members, an age limit, or a limit on the years one man could serve.

Another frequent suggestion is that members be restricted to one committee or subcommittee chairmanship, giving more young members a crack at power. Today, multiple chairmanships abound. Representative F. Edward Hebert (D-La.) heads four Armed Services subcommittees. Wright Patman of Texas heads Banking & Currency, three subcommittees, and the Joint Economic Committee every other term.

Mandate. The task forces could also simply limit chairmen's powers by permitting a

majority of any panel to call a meeting when the chairman refuses. But task force members feel their mandate goes beyond that.

"Seniority has become a symbol of Congress' alleged unresponsiveness," says Representative Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio) of the GOP task force. "We'll make some specific suggestions for change because we sense real discontent with the present system."

A NEW BREED OF IN-HOUSE EXPERT

When Congress finally gets around to overhauling the seniority system, the breed of lawmaker most likely to take over will be the legislative technician—the specialist—rather than just a younger edition of the cloakroom wheeler-dealer who dominates the scene today.

The trend toward specialization has been quietly gaining momentum for years. This is particularly true in the House, where 435 members strive for reputations and power within the framework of 16 principal committees.

Traditionally, specialization has gone hand-in-hand with the power built up through seniority; a congressman tended to focus on the subject matter of the committee where he landed, or on the special interest of his constituents. Recently, two things have given the trend a healthy shove forward—and in a different direction. One is the increasing and more complicated volume of Congressional business. The other is the militance of younger members, many of whom arrive with the desire and background to take a leadership role in legislation right away.

The reasons for choosing a specialty are as varied as the subjects. Representative James T. Broyhill, a Republican, started delving into cable television's potential, he says, "because my district in the mountains of North Carolina can't get good TV reception."

Representative Williamson Stuckey, Jr. (D-Ga.), has become the chief spokesman of the mutual fund industry in the Commerce Committee, though he is only in his second term. "It was the first bill I could get interested in that was major legislation. I thought the funds were getting a raw deal, so I got in," he says.

Representative David Pryor (D-Ark.) recently made national headlines with his exposé of nursing home standards. He based his findings on visits he made, disguised as an attendant, to a number of rest homes.

Representative Morris Udall (D-Ariz.), an outspoken reformer, says specialization will give the younger members "a piece of the action."

"This is where we in the House have it all over the Senate," says Udall. "A senator has to serve on six committees and maybe 20 subcommittees. There is no reason why a freshman member of the House can't become the leading expert on a subject in his first term."

WINDS OF CHANGE

So pervasive is the trend toward specialization that even members of the House establishment applaud it. Representative Hale Boggs (D-La.), who doubles as majority whip and as a member of the Ways & Means Committee, says that "a man coming up here for his first term should be prepared to specialize or he shouldn't come at all. . . . The day will come when men will run for Congress pointing to the skills they have already—in engineering or science, say—and to what they will do with those skills in Congress."

The day may be here already. In March, the famous oceanographer Athelstan Spilhaus announced he was running for Congress as a Republican from Florida. The 58-year-old retired professor said that he would stress his work with Presidential science commissions and his expertise in pollution control and resource uses of the ocean.

CHOICES

A specialty may not be that easy to come by for every new member of Congress. Skills developed in private life or in state politics may be blind alleys for an ambitious new arrival.

But focusing on an area outside one's training can be rewarding. Representative Jack Brooks (D-Tex.), a newspaperman and lawyer, was an early advocate of computer time-sharing by government agencies. Now, as chairman of the Government Operations subcommittee on government activities, Brooks is the House's resident expert on the future of computerization. "Folks back home may not know too much about computers, but they can sure understand when you save hundreds of millions of dollars in tax money by using them," says Brooks. "And you can be sure I let them know."

Representative Joseph Karth (D-Minn.), was a semiskilled laborer who became a national union organizer and chairman of the labor committee of the Minnesota state legislature. Now the leading expert on space science research, Karth credits his college engineering studies, which were interrupted by World War II, and "a lot of midnight oil," for his reputation.

"Sure, I wanted to get on Education & Labor when I came here, but there wasn't room and someone had to go on Science & Astronautics," Karth says. "It's been hard, but I've gotten a great deal of satisfaction out of learning something new."

ON THE VANISHING MIDDLE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, to those who think they know which side they are rooting for in the struggle between "left-wing anarchy" and "right-wing repression," I commend the thoughtful editorial from today's Washington Post, which points out quite rightly that the distinction between the two sides is a "distinction without a difference." To embrace either is to embrace a loser. The editorial follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PEACEABLE PEOPLE

"One might suppose that as extremists become increasingly inflammatory, moderates would close ranks and oppose them. But just the opposite is occurring. The moderates begin to take sides against one another. . . . Left this gives the impression that moderates are victimized, let it be said at once that most of them have a secret complicity in the activities of the extremist. The moderate conservative does not explicitly approve of police brutality, but something in him is not displeased when the billy club comes down on the head of a long-haired student. The liberal does not endorse violence by the extreme left; but he may take extreme pleasure in such action when it discomfits those in authority."

The observation comes from the text of an undelivered speech by John Gardner, parts of which were printed on this page a while back. About the same time—on the heels of the Kent State killings—a long and exceedingly wise editorial in the Wall Street Journal made a number of similar points. It turned a shaft of light on the intellectual acrobatics of those who know better but who still manage to condone the brutalities of the violent left, and it was equally unsparing of those—who also know better—who cannot conceal a degree of brutish joy when the violent left meets violent counterattack. Since then we have had, in addi-

tion, Sen. Margaret Chase Smith's perceptive and moving appeal to the same persons, based on the same analysis of where the real danger lies in our present social chaos:

"It is time that the great center of our people, those who reject the violence and unreasonableness of both the extreme right and the extreme left, searched their consciences, mustered their moral and physical courage, shed their intimidated silence, and declared their consciences. It is time that with dignity, firmness and friendliness, they reason with, rather than capitulate to, the extremists on both sides—at all levels—and caution that their patience ends at the border of violence—and anarchy that threatens our American democracy."

Both Mrs. Smith and the Wall Street Journal warned—accurately in our opinion—that anarchy on the left will beget repression from the right and that in any ultimate conflict between the two, repression is likely to prevail.

There are several things to be said about all this, and the first, in our view, is that these sensible, anguished voices are speaking truth—and they are speaking it in a disinterested, and therefore most compelling, way. Sen. Smith and Mr. Gardner are Republicans, and the Wall Street Journal is constitutionally conservative in outlook. Yet in none of their warnings concerning the radical students is there even the most faintly perceptible sound of a grinding ax. For these are not contestants in a national street-fight, contributors to our chaos who announce from on high that they see no reason to "lower their voices" or stop "shouting fire" until Jerry Rubin does. They do not view themselves that way. They are too repelled by the incivilities on all sides to undertake to manufacture more, and they have properly fixed their attention on the people in the stands—the nation's moderates, left and right, who are only tangentially involved in the fist-swinging and name-calling—as holding the key to how the thing comes out. "The notable fact about civil tumult today," John Gardner said, "is not that a few fanatics start it but that larger numbers of peaceable people tolerate it and lend themselves to it." The most "worrisome thing in the [New York hardhats] episode," the Journal observed, "was not violence by the workers but the cheering and confetti-throwing by the crowds of presumably respectable citizens."

We expect that if Mrs. Smith or Mr. Gardner or the editorialists at the Journal were asked whether they could not go back through the past few years and identify moments and moods in which they themselves had taken a mental short-cut or two in these matters, they would reply that they could. We know that we can. For it is characteristic of situations such as that to which this country has now come, that people and groups of people don't march into them in phalanx formation, eyes ahead, all self-aware: rather they slip into them, a bit at a time, sideways. And surely anyone who is honest knows why. There are, first, predispositions and perspectives that simply allow each of us to take some acts of violence seriously and not quite focus on others, perhaps for unwitting reasons of political or emotional convenience. Witness the outcries about the hardhats on the part of people who could view more (politically) congenial bashing with relative calm; and witness the outrage expressed over left-wing inspired bombings by people who didn't and don't give a damn that hundreds of Negro churches and homes have been bombed and/or burned in the South in recent years. There is, again, beyond the problem of perspective, the very real effect of the cross-tug. One talks with a student who is touching and makes sense, a shopkeeper whose view is no less affecting or persuasive, and it's all a bit like the war in Vietnam and people's reaction to it: only those who are not aware of their own limitations can find their way through all the complexities and uncertainties and mutually

cancelling truths of our social turmoil without doubt or inconsistency. So one day you're enraged and the next day you're mild and the day after that there is something else on your mind. And meanwhile it all gets worse—imperceptibly at first and then perceptibly. Around that time, if a nation has any luck at all, people like those we have cited will blow the whistle.

What should be plain to all of us by now is that the tired old locutions and debater's points don't constitute a worthy response—the so's-your-old-man line of reasoning that condones, or at least accepts, unspeakable acts on one side on the grounds that the other side has been even more unspeakable. There is another, less crude and infinitely more insidious response that Mrs. Smith's allusion to the Joseph McCarthy years got us to thinking about, and it too seems a good candidate for extinction—namely, the sentiment (never quite put in those historically fraught terms) that exculpates student and other violence on the grounds that one agrees with their objectives but does not approve of some of their tactics. For just as it was the last time around, tactics and objectives are inextricably bound together in this affair. Anyone who believes it is of no consequence that buildings are burned or bombed or that people are harmed or brute force exerted in the name of stopping the violence in Vietnam, plainly does not know what is wrong with the war there. And anyone hailing a different political row, who believes it is acceptable for policemen or Guardsmen to gun down unarmed students or Black Panthers or rioters, does not know what is wrong about the campus or black violence he purports to deplore and similarly disqualifies himself as credible critic.

What Sen. Smith and Mr. Gardner and the Journal (and, we should add, a number of other voices) have done is to give meaning and illustration to that mindstopper "polarization," which they have wisely identified with the ungenerous new emotions of both the moderate right and left—the vanishing middle. We would add one point to their arguments, and, roughly, it is that there is nothing to "polarize" about. For it is true, in practical political terms, that a distinction can be drawn between "left-wing anarchy" and "right-wing repression," that the latter will tend to prevail in any broad-scale conflict, and that neither can, by its nature, win anything much worth winning in the end. But in another and maybe more important sense, it is a distinction without a difference. Surely those so-called "anarchists" of the left—the shouters-down and seizers and bombers—are in fact repressors. And surely "repression" in the form of extralegal police violence or hardhat rampaging is of a piece with anarchy so far as its effect on order, law, and authority is concerned—is anarchy, in fact. The first is no suitable refuge (even at second hand, from the stands) for people of the left who fancy themselves free spirits. The second is no suitable refuge for people of the right who believe themselves traditionalists, upholders of duly constituted order. The combatants will doubtless keep up the fighting. But isn't it time for everyone else to wonder what he is so loudly (or secretly) cheering for?

GET INVOLVED

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable duties that I have as a Congressman is to deliver the commencement addresses at several high schools in my district each year. It is

a pleasure to see our young people ending their high school education and going either on to college or into the business world.

This year, I was invited to speak at the Pell City High School's commencement exercises. I was particularly impressed by the valedictory and salutatory addresses delivered by members of the graduating class. Because of the timeliness of these addresses and the views expressed by these young people, I would like to insert them in the Record at this point.

The valedictory address entitled "Get Involved" was delivered by Debra Ann Alverson and the salutatory address was delivered by Charles Dennis Abbott.

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Charles Dennis Abbott as the salutatory address for the graduation exercises at Pell City High School on Friday, May 22, 1970, at 8 p.m.:

Faculty and friends, I wish to extend to each of you the warmest of welcomes and to express our appreciation for the support and assistance that you have given us for so many years. Through our years of public education you have guided us with patience mingled with hope. Now, as we await the final steps of graduation, there are no words capable of expressing our gratitude.

We are venturing into a new world—a frightening world—a world we have had no part in creating. But we possess one great advantage over any human being in our country. That advantage is being an American citizen. We will journey along life's path with the same basic rights granted to each and every individual. How we use these rights determines our destiny.

With each right, however, there is a responsibility; and it is this burden that weighs heavily upon our shoulders—responsibility which some of us have never known. The very word frightens us. After tonight, however, we must meet the challenge, we must grow up, we must face responsibilities, and we must make our own decisions.

We will make our own decisions and we will live with the results of our choices for the rest of our lives. But we, at least, have the right to make the decisions. We are American citizens living in a free society under a democratic government—a government which cannot exist without rights, responsibilities, and decisions. Human sense is still the lifeline of this great country even though we do live in an age of mechanized brains and computers. Indeed, this country is run on "the will of man."

And in the same sense our society thrives on "the will of man." Our country can only be as great as we want it to be. Our rights and responsibilities can be fulfilled only if we want to fulfill them. And, more importantly, our future lives can only be as good as we wish them to be. We, as Americans, possess the rights and abilities, and it is our duty to our country and to our personal lives to use them.

Through our basic training in high school we have learned to forgive, to share, and to possess. But most importantly, we have learned to become involved—involved in pep rallies, sports events, school elections, and many other extra-curricular activities. This involvement has helped us to realize the democratic way of life: this life of "better to give of yourself than receive." This admonition of being an American with rights and responsibilities, this thought of being a part of a country, a state, a city, and even a school. We are ready to meet the challenge, and I think we will succeed. And so it is tonight that I, as do the other Seniors, welcome you "on the first day of the rest of our lives." Thank you.

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Debra Ann Alverson as the valedictory address for the graduation exercises at Pell City High School on Friday, May 22, 1970, at 8 p.m.:

GET INVOLVED!

When Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," he became involved. When George Washington consented to serve as President of a newborn nation, he became involved. When Franklin D. Roosevelt began to jerk the American economy out of a severe depression, he became involved. When Ralph Nader acted as self-appointed overseer of consumer interests, he became involved. When Richard Nixon decided to send United States troops into Cambodia to stamp out the kindling fires of Communist takeover there, he became involved. Can we, as United States citizens, do any less?

It is so easy to become *uninvolved*. It is possible to lie on one's living room couch, exclaim over the horrors of war as reflected on the newsreels, push a button on the automatic channel changer, and watch reruns of the "I Love Lucy" show. Or, one could listen to reports of highway fatalities on the radio, and then search for another station that is playing the latest "Three Dog Night" record. Or, perhaps upon scanning the front page of one's newspaper and reading of a violent demonstration, one quickly flips through to find the funnies. And, upon arriving at one's favorite swimming spot at a lake or stream and finding the stench of pollution unbearable, it is possible to merely begin swimming at a public pool. But, these and other problems confront people every day, and I contend that it is not right to assume a passive attitude toward them. In order for these or any other problems to be solved, someone must be interested in solving them. Someone must be involved!

To be involved does not necessarily mean to picket the city hall daily or to take part in a demonstration at the local university, but it does mean to be concerned with things which happen in one's own community and in the world also. We, who are almost high school graduates, have a responsibility to learn what we can about world, national, state, and local affairs because in approximately three years, we will have a voice in them. A citizen who does not bother to care about the problems surrounding him is not a very effective voice in choosing the right officials and in making the right decisions. An informed citizenry is the key to an effective government, and an informed citizenry is one which is concerned, knowledgeable, and, above all, involved.

I've mentioned the word "involved" many times, but perhaps some are asking the question "What is she talking about? How can I become involved in anything?" I submit to you that "involved" covers a wide range of meaning. For the past twelve years, all of us have been involved in the take of obtaining a high school education. But, after this night, the paths of our lives will divert in many different directions, and we will no longer be known as a senior class but as 138 separate individuals. Some of us are going to college or trade schools; others are beginning to pave their own way in life by holding a job; still others have chosen to be married. But, no matter what path we choose, each of us has the responsibility of recognizing problems which are around us and doing our best to correct them. However, before deciding whether or not to be involved in a certain problem, it is imperative that one think about every aspect of that problem, weigh the pros and cons in one's mind, and act upon his decision only when he feels very deeply in his heart that his decision is right. After deciding to become involved, his actions must be constructive; the actions of the men fighting in southeastern Asia is con-

structive; lying down in the streets is not. Forking out a few extra tax dollars to fight the pollution of our environment is constructive; protest rallies are not.

In conclusion, I would like to say that each of us has a responsibility to ourselves, our community, and our country. This responsibility is to be aware of the problems around us, to be concerned enough to search for a solution to these problems, and to be involved enough to be willing to work toward the correction of these problems. In other words, get involved.

WIDOWS OF MILITARY MEN NEED ADDITIONAL BENEFITS

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD today an editorial that appeared in the Fallon Eagle Standard in Fallon, Nev., April 14, 1970, wherein our colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative CHARLES GUBSER of California's 10th District, is noted as having introduced a bill to provide for military retirees to receive the same survivor benefits that are offered to civilian Federal retirees.

I wish to be on record as in support of such legislation and urge my colleagues in the House to put their support behind this measure, H.R. 6226.

Following is the editorial:

MILITARY WIDOWS SAID TO BE "LEFT HOLDING THE BAG"

The Fleet Reserve Association fights for Widow's Equity. What do we mean by the Widow's Equity Bill?

The widows of retired military personnel are really left holding the bag. By this I mean, upon the death of a retired member, the pension that was being received by the retired member is cut off at the time of his death.

The widow of a retired military man is the only widow who does not receive an annuity based on her husband's retired pay. Many believe the retiree's pension will continue after the retiree's death. This is far from the truth. This is a cruel inequity and should be corrected. The Fleet Reserve Association, an organization of more than 75,000 career Sailors and Marines, has launched an intensive legislative program to correct this inequity. The FRA has conducted a comprehensive, eighteen month study of Survivor Benefit Programs offered to the Government and Private Enterprises. The FRA has drafted Corrective Legislation which provided for military retirees to receive the same survivor benefits that are offered to Civilian Federal Retirees. This bill was introduced by Representative Charles S. Gubser of California's Tenth District, on February 5, 1969. H.R. 6226 is now before the House Committee on Armed Services.

The principal of the bill is widely supported by members of the house, including Chairman L. Mendel Rivers.

Under the provisions of H.R. 6226 the widows will receive no more than widows of Federal Civilian retirees are receiving. To get the benefits they should be receiving now H.R. 6226 should be enacted into law immediately.

Career Sailors, Marines, and Retirees of both services should join with our shipmates, both locally and nationally in gaining support for H.R. bill number 6226 your Widow's Equity Bill.

THE CLAUDE GARRETT SOCIETY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the old Chinese proverb which teaches that "a journey of a thousand miles must begin with the first step" is being put into practice by a group of very civic minded citizens of Goodlettsville, Tenn., in their efforts to combat pollution.

Through a new organization known as the Claude Garrett Society has no dues but requires only that members actively engage in an antilitter campaign by picking up at least five pieces of litter daily.

The Goodlettsville Gazette recently carried an account of the new organization and how it functions. I insert the article from the Gazette in the RECORD at this point:

CLAUDE GARRETT SOCIETY FORMED

A positive approach to the pollution problem was initiated today in Goodlettsville, by a new society known as the Claude Garrett Society. There are no dues. To be a member a person simply has to sign the pledge with any of the officers of this society, and if he will be positive in his fight for cleanliness as far as he is personally concerned. The society was named the Claude Garrett Society because of Garrett's constant picking up of litter and debris in order to make Goodlettsville cleaner. It was pointed out that when one of Goodlettsville's most prominent and beloved citizens takes time from his busy activities and his work in order to make the City of Goodlettsville a cleaner city that was a good name for other businessmen and citizens and students of the Goodlettsville area.

The program in its beginning stage is quite simple, not only will the members not pollute nor defile nor litter the area, but they will engage actively in pledging to themselves and to each other that they will pick up five (5) pieces litter daily with Sunday being excepted and deposit same in a trash can or waste basket. This is the first positive approach to this problem without engaging in just rhetoric and talking or telling the other man what he can do, but actually doing yourself.

The new officers of the society are L. Kenneth Johnson, a local attorney, President; Frank R. Tinnon, owner of Matt Thomson Realty Company, First Vice-President; Thurman F. Brooks, owner of Brooks' American Service Station and Councilman, Second Vice-President; Dr. James King, owner Acme Pharmacy, Third Vice-President; Charles Prentice, Fourth Vice-President; Sarah Crabtree, Secretary-Treasurer.

Frank R. Tinnon, First Vice-President, pointed out that all civic organizations and churches are asked to support this worthy program as it costs nothing and will pay great dividends in beautifying our area, and there is no telling where it might stop. He further pointed out that he had already secured a stick with a nail in it in order to help him in picking up debris.

Those wishing to join this worthy enterprise may turn their name in to any of the officers of the society as aforementioned, or churches or local civic organizations can simply draw up a paper wherein the people agree to pick up five (5) pieces of litter a day and not to litter. These papers will be turned in to the Secretary-Treasurer, then they will be enrolled as members of the Claude Garrett Society.

The President, L. Kenneth Johnson, pointed out that they would appreciate hearing any further suggestions as to how we might make our area cleaner and more beautiful, and that they hope that this is only a small beginning for a great enterprise headed in the right direction, based upon personal initiative and headed in a positive way toward the goals of our country and community.

L. Kenneth "Ken" Johnson, president of the Claude Garrett Society, said he had received suggestions that an area in particular need of cleaning up is that coming off the interstate into Goodlettsville.

It was suggested that many members of the Claude Garrett Society who are walking for health or for other reasons, direct their walking activities to this particular area to clean it up pointing out it would be a healthy and good presentation of the City of Goodlettsville to prospective home-owners, buyers, etc. It was also pointed out that the Goodlettsville Plaza area has a great deal of litter on the outside edges that need to be cleaned up, and particular attention is directed to members of the society to pick up debris in this area, if convenient.

It has, also, been suggested during the past week that an award be given to the neatest and cleanest business and the neatest and cleanest residence and the most improved business and residence. Any other comments or suggestions will be welcomed by any officer of the society. These suggestions should be turned in to Sarah Crabtree, secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, a very important aspect of the activity of the Claude Garrett Society in addition to the fact that it is going to reduce litter and the unsightliness caused by litter, is that it initiates very positive personal commitment to doing something about the pollution problem. If an individual takes the time to pick up five pieces of trash daily he is going to become very much aware of and concerned about the larger and more difficult aspects of environmental pollution. This in turn can lead to a very positive commitment on a much larger scale to put an end to this blight and restore quality to our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Goodlettsville within Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson county, is my new home and I am extremely proud to live in a community with conscientious neighbors and fellow citizens who are actively engaged in improving their community on a day-to-day basis.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the tabulated results of my questionnaire I mailed to my district this spring:

[Public document—official business]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: Here is the copy of my questionnaire I mailed to you this spring.

As we are entering the 1970's, it is generally agreed by our U.S. citizens that there must be a re-ordering of national priorities for this decade. We must set 10 year goals

and work toward new national achievements. The American people and both parties realize this.

These government policies will have great effect on the lives of each of us, our families and friends—even determining the security of the American people and the directions of our national progress.

At the close of the 60's we should not forget, with all our problems and divisions among our people, the tremendous advances that the USA has made. We have learned what we can do when we in the US organize our brains, management, our scientists, engineering and technical skills for the Apollo lunar programs. We Americans did beat the USSR in the moon race—we all should be very proud of our US astronauts and each US citizen for this unbelievable accomplishment of the absolutely perfect Apollo 11 and Apollo 12 missions. What has been learned in systems management through NASA, can now be applied to US domestic problems.

In the 70's, we must work for a sound US economy with everybody sharing in the good things and good life we can provide. Our goal must be real progress without runaway inflation, unemployment, high taxes and more debt. The Vietnam war must be brought to a speedy close, with the thanks of a grateful nation for our US servicemen and women, and their families who have served and sacrificed for our good Country with such unselfish patriotism and devotion. We must work as good citizens of the Free World and must try to avoid future Vietnams.

But how do we accomplish these things? We must order our US priorities to reach these high goals that most of us in our Congressional District are agreed on. Here is your chance to participate! As an added service to our District people, I am writing each home, asking your advice and considered opinion. The results will be given direct to you, to the President, to our US Congress and to our Pennsylvania legislators and state officials.

Please take the responsibility of making the decision on your priorities on the reverse of this sheet (even lack of answer is counted as little interest for your Ward, Boro or Township).

This is our Country—let's unite and run our Government the right way, for the benefit and opportunity for all of us—and most important, the safety and security of our families and friends, and the fine American people.

I'm proud to be an American!—and deeply appreciate the opportunity you have given me to serve in Washington as Congressman. Your interest will help me and my office give good intelligent representation.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM OUR SOUTH PITTSBURGH AND SOUTH COUNTY 27TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Here are the answers and recommendations of the citizens of our South Pittsburgh and South County 27th Congressional District tabulated separately by groups. I believe you will be interested in the different positions taken by these various groups of citizens, as I have been.

Amazingly, there appears to me to be no generation gap or even a communication gap among our people, young or old. We have received more answers to this questionnaire setting our priorities for 1970 than on any questionnaire we have ever sent.

We have received an extraordinary number of replies from our high school students, and recent graduates.

Our young people in our District are really interested and want to participate actively in our government decision-making process. I welcome such a generous voluntary response and participation.

Top five priority issues

(No. 1 is highest, 2 next highest, etc.)

Registered voters:	Percent
1. Inflation, high price supports on food	25
2. Crime control and drug problems	19
3. Vietnam war	18
4. Tax reduction, reduced government spending	17
5. Education and vocational training	15
Other	6

Teachers:	Percent
1. Education and vocational training	28
2. Vietnam war	25
3. Inflation, high price supports on food	22
4. Crime control and drug problems	11
5. Antipollution programs, conservation	9
Other	5

Present high school students:	Percent
1. Vietnam war	30
2. Education and vocational training	24
3. Inflation, high price supports on food	23
4. Antipollution programs, conservation	12
5. Crime control and drug problems	6
Other	5

High school graduates of past 3 years (age 18 to 21 years):	Percent
1. Vietnam war	35
2. Antipollution programs, conservation	23
3. Education and vocational training	17
4. Inflation, high price supports on food	10
5. Population control	8
Other	7

Lowest five priority issues (least wanted)

(No. 1 is lowest, 2 next lowest, et cetera)

Registered voters:	Percent
1. More civil rights legislation	27
2. SST program	25
3. More atom bombs	15
4. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	12
5. Busing students	10
Other	10

Teachers:	Percent
1. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	32
2. Busing students	21
3. More atom bombs	19
4. Prayer in public schools	4
5. ABM—2d phase	8
Other	6

Present high school students:	Percent
1. More atom bombs	33
2. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	22
3. SST program	17
4. More civil rights legislation	16
5. Busing students	7
Other	5

High school graduates of past 3 years (age 18 to 21 years):	Percent
1. More atom bombs	34
2. ABM—2d phase	24
3. Busing students	14
4. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	11
5. SST program	9
Other	7

Most opposed programs (on this question most people simply stated they opposed three to five programs without stating their preference)

Registered voters:	Percent
1. More atom bombs	80
2. Vietnam war	80
3. Increased Federal debt	79
4. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	79
5. Busing students	78

Teachers:	Percent
1. Cotton and tobacco subsidies	67
2. Busing students	58
3. More atom bombs	57
4. Vietnam war	46

5. Government guaranteed annual income	46
Present high school students:	
1. Vietnam war	59
2. More atom bombs	57
3. Unemployment	49
4. State income tax	39
5. More civil rights legislation	35
High school graduates of past 3 years (age 18 to 21 years):	
1. More atom bombs	73
2. Busing students	64
3. Vietnam war	56
4. State income tax	49
5. ABM—2d phase	45

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN H. DENT, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT AFL-CIO MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address I made to the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department luncheon on June 10, 1970:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN H. DENT, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT AFL-CIO MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON

It is always a pleasure to come back to one of these Maritime Trades Department luncheons—because this is one of the groups that fully appreciates the message that I have been trying to get across to the American people for years: The message that we have been cutting our own economic throats in this country by knuckling under to the competition of foreign industry.

You, in the maritime industry, are acutely aware of what damage this cutthroat competition can do. You have seen American imports and exports increasing at dramatic rates over the past several decades—and, at the same time, you have seen your share of this business decline at an alarming rate.

One of the things that must hurt the most is the knowledge that a large share of this unfair competition has come from some of your fellow citizens—from the American-owned shipping companies which have built, registered, and manned their vessels in foreign countries, and then have cynically turned around and competed for American cargo. These companies have profited unconscionably by taking bread out of your mouths.

As I have said, this is an old issue—and a sore one—with the maritime industry. I am pleased that you long ago enlisted in the battle to put an end to this runaway-flag menace to America's economy and to her ability to defend herself in time of crisis. You, in the maritime industry, and I are old allies in this fight—reaching back to hearings which I first chaired in 1962, and to even earlier efforts on both our parts to put an end to the rising tide of foreign competition which poses such a threat to our Nation.

I also know that your concern about this issue extends beyond your own industry—that you are involved in the larger fight to see that our trade with foreign nations is conducted on a basis that is fair to American industry, fair to American workers and fair to the American economy. I applaud the efforts of the Maritime Trades Department, and its affiliated national and international unions, to focus the spotlight of public opinion on the unfair tactics used by foreign industry—aided and abetted by

foreign governments—as the first step toward enactment of corrective legislation.

And let me emphasize that the proper word is "corrective," and not "protective," as some people charge. Foreign governments provide incentives for their industries engaged in world commerce, and they provide safeguards against competition from other nations. This is particularly true in the maritime industry, which other countries underwrite in countless different ways, so that it can cut the price of shipping cargo, and thus attract business to its fleet. It is about time that we showed the same concern in this country—not only for our merchant fleet but for all American industries which have to compete in the world marketplace to stay alive and to stay healthy.

This is the reason why I supported so enthusiastically the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which passed the House by a margin of 307 to 1 last month, and which is now awaiting action by the Senate. At the root of that legislation is a determination—long overdue—to make the American merchant marine competitive with foreign shipping.

This legislation has an enormous potential. It opens the way to putting the American flag back onto the high seas—and we all know that we have been virtually driven off the world's seaboards by ships flying the flags of other nations. It opens the way for reducing the soaring deficit in our international balance of payments. Dollars that are spent to haul cargo to and from the United States in foreign bottoms are dollars that are taken out of our own economic stream. By making the American-flag fleet competitive, we will be plugging one of the leaks that are causing this dollar drain.

It opens the way for bringing back under the American flag the ships that now fly runaway flags. The return of the cargo-carrying capacity of these vessels will mean more jobs for seafarers, more profits for American business, and more tax dollars for the United States—and these dollars, in turn, can be put to work building more ships in American shipyards, and that will lead to more jobs in shipbuilding and steel plating and in a variety of other domestic industries, and still more profits for American business and more tax dollars for the Federal Treasury.

For 3 years, the spiral has worked the other way. We have exported seagoing jobs, business profits, and tax dollars, and this has caused a lessening of demand, jobs, profits, and tax revenues in all of the supporting industries and services upon which shipping and shipbuilding rely.

I would have preferred it—and I know you would have, too—if this legislation had slammed the door on the runaway-flag operations immediately. But I also know—and I trust that you are also aware—that it would have been unrealistic to expect that an arbitrary end to the runaway operation could have worked.

If we had issued an ultimatum to the runaway operators, telling them to either give up their foreign holdings immediately, or else give up any chance to be eligible for the benefits that are available under this new program, their answer would have been emphatic: Given that kind of "either-or" choice, they would have gone foreign, and stayed foreign—and we never would have put an end to this runaway situation.

Let me tell you why I say that:

The runaway situation did not "just happen." To a large extent, it was a creation of the U.S. Government. At the end of World War II, the Government was so anxious to dispose of the huge wartime fleet that it encouraged many operators to buy these ships at bargain-basement prices and register them under foreign flags. The Government went further—by amending the Internal Revenue Code to specifically exempt

the profits of these runaway shipping operations from American taxes. And the Government had created the climate that made all of this possible by the way in which it limited benefits under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to just a handful of American shipping companies. Since the 14 subsidized companies were the only ones which could possibly compete with foreign-flag operations, that act, alone, forced scores of American companies to use the foreign-flag device—with its cheap foreign building costs, its cheap foreign labor costs, and its great tax advantage—in order to stay in business.

Congress is finally doing something about this. The bill passed by the House extends the benefits of our merchant marine program to all operators, in all segments of the industry. For the first time in our history, we are proposing that all elements of this industry be treated fairly and equitably.

That is a powerful incentive to attract the runaway shipping operations back to the American flag. But you have to apply some test of reasonableness to this move, because, as you know, the runaway operators have substantial holdings, and a share of their present operations is composed of relatively new ships. An operator is unlikely to scrap a ship which still has economic life left in it—particularly when he knows that it will take years before the program now working its way through Congress will become fully effective and completely implemented. And an operator is also unlikely to sell a vessel which still has economic life left in it—because that vessel would then remain in the trade, competing with him for the cargo that moves between this country and other countries.

That is why this legislation proposes an orderly way to resolve the problem. It puts an operator on notice that, if he wants to participate in the American maritime program, he must agree to freeze his foreign holdings at their April 15, 1970, level. And he must phase out that foreign operation over a 20-year span—a span equal to the economic life of a vessel.

This does not mean that we will have to face the full brunt of the runaway situation for another 20 years, far from it. Many of the ships in the runaway fleets are right now nearing the end of their economic usefulness. Once those ships are retired or scrapped, they cannot be replaced. If any of the runaway-flag ships are lost at sea, they cannot be replaced. If any charters for foreign-flag vessels expire, they cannot be renewed.

In other words, we are talking about an orderly—and accelerating—phaseout of the runaway operations during the 20-year period. During that same time, we will be phasing in on an orderly—and, I hope, accelerating—basis, a modern, efficient, speedy American-flag fleet.

As I say, I know of your long fight against the runaways. I think I sense in the Maritime Trades Department a preference for an immediate end to the runaway problem, if that were possible. But I would caution you to be realistic, to accept the fact that this legislation finally establishes both a principle with regard to the runaways and an orderly, acceptable and realistic method for bringing an end to this situation which has had such disastrous effects on this industry and on the American economy.

I would hope that, by establishing this principle with relation to runaway-flag shipping, the Congress will proceed to review the entire issue of international trade in the same light—particularly with reference to the American manufacturers who have runaway from fair labor standards in this country, set up shop in foreign lands, and who are now flooding the American market with goods produced at sweatshop wages.

I have said many times before—including, I am sure, in one of my appearances here—

that there are three cornerstones to the American economy: Production, distribution, and consumption. And I have said that we must protect all three cornerstones in order to keep our economy healthy.

Through the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, we are shoring up one of those cornerstones: Distribution. Now let us get to work to protect the ones which remain—production and consumption—so that our economy can get back on the high road once again.

Thank you very much.

IMPORTS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and foreign origin.

We can all agree that there are benefits to be derived by our country as well as by other nations through the promotion of free trade. However, in the electronic field the volume of imports has become so overwhelming that it has severely dislocated the domestic industry, put thousands of Americans out of work, and almost completely halted American production of many basic electronic products and components.

I include at this point in the RECORD both an analysis of my legislation and testimony presented to the Ways and Means Committee which outlines the plight of the American electronic worker:

ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR AN EQUITABLE SHARING OF THE U.S. MARKET BY ELECTRONIC ARTICLES OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN ORIGIN

Section 1 of the bill provides that the total quantity and value of any consumer electronic product and accessories of foreign manufacture that may be imported (or released from storage) for domestic consumption in any calendar year shall not exceed the quantity or value in which that product was imported (or released from storage) for domestic consumption in 1966. The proviso specifies that if the domestic consumption of an article increases (or decreases) more than 5% from the 1966 level, then the ceiling on imports of that article will be adjusted in an amount proportionate to the change in domestic consumption.

Section 2 of the bill parallels Section 1 with respect to electronic components of foreign manufacture of the types used in the manufacture of consumer electronic products. The base period here is the average for the three calendar years 1964-1966 inclusive.

Section 3 of the bill provides that during the year in which the bill becomes effective the formulas utilized in Sections 1 and 3 of the bill shall be applied but the amount of the base domestic production used to calculate the maximum on imports shall be reduced to the proportion of the base year or years consumption which corresponds to the proportion of the calendar year remaining in which this bill is enacted.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall allocate to importing countries a share of the allowable imports of consumer electronic products and components of particular types based upon the amount of past imports of such products by such countries during a representative period.

The Secretary is permitted in his allocation to give due account to special factors which have affected, or may affect, the trade in any types of electronic articles. The Secretary is to give special favorable weight in the allocation process to foreign countries which have no greater restrictions on imports into their countries from this country upon their imports of such articles. The Secretary is to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the allocations made under this Section.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce, upon any interested party's application, determine whether domestic production of any article involved in this Act in conjunction with imports allowed under this Act is adequate to meet estimated annual consumption of the article. If a deficiency in domestic production is found, the Secretary is to determine the increase in imports that is required to eliminate the deficiency on the next calendar year, and to certify his determination to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 6 authorized the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries to provide for orderly and equitable access to our domestic markets in accordance with this Act. In accordance with any such agreements, the President may by proclamation adjust the amounts of imports allocated to foreign countries pursuant to this Act.

Section 7 of the bill provides that the release into our domestic markets of imported articles covered by this Act shall be regulated on a quarterly basis.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the determinations of the Secretary of Commerce and President under the Act shall be final.

Section 9 provides that the bill is effective upon enactment.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED ON PENDING FOREIGN TRADE PROPOSALS

(Submitted by and on behalf of: International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.)

Our testimony is offered in behalf of the employees of the electrical and electronic products manufacturing industries as a matter of joint concern by the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers AFL-CIO, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers AFL-CIO and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers AFL-CIO. Our three international unions have a combined membership of close to 2,250,000 workers.

The developments that have been taking place at the workshop level in our electrical-electronic manufacturing plants in all sections of the United States lead inescapably to the conclusion of an industry in crisis.

Our local unions and local lodges have been reeling from the impact of layoffs and plant closings, as employer after employer in the consumer electronics industry of the United States (and Canada) has cut back or suspended production in their North American plants.

U.S.-owned multinational corporations have established hundreds of plants outside the U.S. and Canadian borders, shutting down American and Canadian factories, dismissing their workers, and transferring production and jobs to foreign plants. Wages paid to workers in these facilities range from 10¢ to 35¢ an hour. Moreover, U.S. multinational firms enjoy other "comparative advantages" in host countries such as local tax exemptions, low rents and other concessions.

Components and parts made in the United States plants are shipped to offshore American owned plants (or subcontracted to low-wage foreign manufacturers) for assembly and return to this country. Customs duty is levied only on the "value added" by the extremely low-wage foreign labor.

This practice, which has thrown thousands upon thousands of American workers out of their jobs, is in a large part both directly and indirectly traceable to the abuse and exploitation of Item 807.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

In recent years, U.S. imports of TV sets, radios, radio-phonographs, tape recorders, electronic desk calculators, typewriters, and many other products and parts, have mushroomed. Imports currently supply over 90 percent of radios and tape recorders sold in the U.S. market; between 40 and 50 percent of the black and white, and nearly 20 percent of the color TV sets and most of the household sewing machines, electronic desk calculators, portable typewriters, and a wide variety of electrical, electronic and related products. Moreover, recent American patented inventions, covering such high growth items as video tape recorders, will be produced in Japan and elsewhere, but marketed in this country. Air conditioning systems, home laundry, kitchen and other household appliances will soon disappear from our assembly lines as imports of these foreign produced items reach 1973 projections.

Our technical know-how is literally peddled abroad to foreign firms through licensing agreements and joint-venture partnerships of U.S. and foreign "competitors."

Developed in large measure with government research and development grants, our technology is sold as a commodity to foreign producers and is counted as a profitable source of income by U.S. electronic companies. The workers of the industry, particularly those already unemployed, are deprived of any share in this benefit.

Foreign competitors, freed of the high cost of basic research and development, have been quick to concentrate on elaborating and improving their product lines and to market high quality end products in the top-dollar sales market of the United States.

In any case, whether stemming from the production lines of Japanese or other foreign suppliers or from the offshore subsidiaries of American owned multinational companies, the exploitation of the labor-cost differential is the greatest cause of job loss by American electrical workers.

High U.S. labor costs are blamed as the reason or justification for the flight to low-wage areas. Wages in the consumer electronics industry—not high by American standards—cannot be expected to compete with foreign wages of 10¢ to 35¢ an hour—nor with the \$1 an hour wage-fringe-social benefit costs in Japan. Even if wages were reduced to the \$1.60 legal minimum, they would, with fringe costs added, be more than double the total current Japanese wage-fringe costs. They would be from 8 to 12 times as much as the prevailing labor costs in Singapore, Hong Kong and Taiwan and 5 times as high as prevailing labor costs in Mexico. Thus, these countries enjoy a "comparative advantage" over the U.S. by virtue of pitifully substandard wages with which American wages cannot compete. Nor should they be expected to.

The employees of the electronics industry are the victims of a combination of factors that has caused their jobs to disappear overseas and their skills to become redundant and unmarketable.

The loss of employment has struck impartially at male and female, blue collar and white collar, technicians and degree holding engineers alike. Black Americans and Latin Americans only recently recruited out of the ghettos and barrios for training into the entry jobs of the electronics industry are cruelly thrown back into unemployment.

It is counter-productive to go into the ghettos and barrios with programs to train minority group members for an opportunity to enter the industrial mainstream and then to export these jobs across our borders and overseas. It would seem we are more con-

cerned with solving the labor surplus problems of all countries but our own.

Yet, the types of jobs exported are precisely the unskilled and semiskilled jobs needed here if we are to win the war against poverty and provide dignified and gainful employment for our disadvantaged poor.

In material attached to our statement we trace the loss of over 50,000 factory workers jobs in the radio and TV receiving equipment industry and the electronic components and accessories sector during the period from late 1966 to the first quarter of this year. The play of the same factors that have already caused the loss of 50,000 jobs can be cited to predict the total disappearance of the remaining jobs in these industries unless Congress takes speedy and realistic action.

We ask the Committee to keep in mind that the interests of the workers in this industry are more properly representative of the aims of the American people and the well-being of this country than are the profit-centered compulsions of the American and foreign-based multinational companies who are responsible for our plight:

We urge the Committee to consider the following:

Enactment of truth in import labeling law to identify the manufacturer and country of origin of all imported products.

Elimination of special "value added" tariff loopholes through repeal of Items 806:30 and 807:00 of the Tariff Schedules of the U.S.

Legislation which will limit the unrestrained flood of imports of electronic and electrical products and which will provide a formula for orderly marketing through equitable sharing in an expanding market by all producers of these products.

Adjustment assistance for workers displaced by imports, which would be accessible and readily available through a simplified qualifying process.

Measures which would supervise and curb the outflow of American technical know-how and investment capital and measures which would regulate the mushrooming overseas growth of American based multinational corporations.

We also call for Congressional support for a realistic international program to raise substandard wage levels to narrow the gap with our domestic minimum wage requirements.

Finally, we propose that Congress establish a cabinet level Department of Foreign Trade to combine all the responsibilities and functions now dispersed among many departments and agencies. Frequently these agencies are found to be at cross purposes with one another, and in the unhappy circumstance of the workers of the electrical-electronic industry, unsympathetic and downright hostile to our simple needs.

QUEENS VFW COMMANDER FIGHTS FOR HOSPITAL AND MED SCHOOL

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend, Joseph P. Corbo, of Richmond Hill, N.Y., was installed as Queens County commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His succession to the high-level position was earned by 12 years of dedicated service in the veterans' organization.

During the past 10 years, Joseph Corbo and I have worked together on a number of projects related to veterans,

including the long struggle for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Queens County. Now that Joe Corbo has reached the top position in the Queens County VFW, I am looking forward to renewing our joint effort to see this project through to a successful completion.

The Veterans' Administration has insisted that any new VA hospital be situated adjacent to or near a medical school. Our county does not have a medical school at the present time, but I know that Joe Corbo will provide constructive leadership to citizen efforts to make this kind of complex a reality for Queens County. I certainly pledge my best efforts to work side by side with Joe Corbo and the VFW toward this end.

The new Queens commander served with the 7th Fleet in the South Pacific and was involved in three major campaigns during his 3½ years of naval service. He was honorably discharged in 1946 and served in the Naval Reserves until 1961. He has lived in Richmond Hill for 15 years with his wife, Julia. They have two children, Jane, age 22, and Julia, age 6.

I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Joe Corbo on his years of dedicated service to the more than 230,000 veterans in Queens County and to all programs to benefit veterans in our Nation. I know he will be an outstanding commander and a fine spokesman for our veterans.

HARD HATS HAVE SOLUTION TO WAR

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the construction workers of America and their union leaders are to be commended for their splendid display of valor, courage, and patriotism. Evidence of their concern about the war in Vietnam and support of President Nixon's policies in Southeast Asia was vividly displayed by the recent "Hard Hat" marches in New York City and St. Louis. The more than 50,000 American flags carried in the parades attest to the patriotism of our great construction workers. The beating of women and children in both New York and St. Louis dispels any doubt that they lack valor and courage.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the construction workers of America have provided us with the solution to the war in Vietnam. There were 350,000 construction workers who marched in New York to show their support of American involvement in Vietnam. In St. Louis there were 50,000 construction workers who marched to express the same support. The grand total in New York and St. Louis comes to 400,000 workers who believe that we ought to be fighting to preserve liberty and democracy in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it may be just a coincidence, but there are 400,000 young American men now in Vietnam. Many of them

do not believe they should be there. Most Americans, I am sure, would be eternally grateful to the construction workers of America who really believe in the war—if they would exchange their hard hats and flags for helmets and rifles—and replace our disgruntled servicemen in Vietnam.

DEAF CHILDREN TAXING SPECIAL SCHOOLS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, of the many misfortunes in this life, one of the most poignant is deafness, particularly when it is congenital. Today, about 16,000 youngsters are reaching school age without the gift of hearing because of the German measles epidemic of 1963 to 1965. They and thousands of others whose deafness accrues from other causes depend upon a relatively small number of institutions and some very dedicated teachers and administrators to draw any sense of normalcy from the silence which enshrouds them.

To my mind, the very finest of these institutions is the Clarke School for the Deaf which, I am proud to say, is located at Northampton, in my First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

I have been to this school often, met with the students there and have never come away unimpressed. The work that is being done there and the spirit of the youngsters there is an inspiring example of people struggling to overcome severe adversities.

The problems of the deaf child and the work that is under way to help him is portrayed in the Wall Street Journal edition of May 25. This fine article tells some of the effort that is being put forth at Clarke and other fine institutions for the deaf and I would like to enter it in the RECORD at this time:

MEASLES AFTERMATH—DEAF CHILDREN, BORN IN RUBELLA EPIDEMIC, TAXING SPECIAL SCHOOLS—LIP READING, SIGN LANGUAGE ADVOCATES DIFFER ON BEST WAY TO TEACH YOUNGSTERS—SOME HELP FROM TINY TIM (By Elliott Carlson)

Mrs. Barbara Tommasi's kitchen sometimes sounds more like a boiler factory. She often bangs pots and pans and slams lids just to see how much noise she can make. There is, of course, a reason. Mrs. Tommasi is trying to teach her deaf four-year-old daughter to recognize a variety of sounds.

"I sit Diana near the sink while I clang the pans—anything to make her aware of common, ordinary noises," says the Nashville mother. By teaching Diana to connect sounds with their objects, Mrs. Tommasi is trying to give Diana a learning experience that most deaf youngsters miss.

Diana Tommasi is one of 16,000 youngsters born with hearing impairments resulting from their mothers' contracting German measles while pregnant during the measles epidemic of 1963 to 1965. These children are now of school age, and their education, at home and in public and private schools, is posing problems. Parents are sometimes unable to cope with the problems and, worse,

even to recognize in time that their children have hearing problems. Public schools are by and large ill-equipped to deal with a deaf child, and private schools are finding it difficult to handle the large numbers resulting from the epidemic of German measles, or rubella.

Complicating the situation, the experts in education of the deaf are divided into two camps. There is a bitter controversy among them about the best way to teach the deaf. Some say the youngsters should be taught only to lip read; others insist the deaf should be taught sign language also.

A VACCINE FOR RUBELLA

Rubella itself is now preventable. A vaccine has been developed that is highly effective, and drives are under way in many communities to wipe out the disease completely. Deafness won't be wiped out, of course—rubella is a big cause but not the only cause of deafness—but the strain on the schools for the deaf probably will never again be what it is now.

Health officials warn that there may be another epidemic of rubella next year unless the vaccination program is broadened. But even if deafness does again increase, the parents of the children will have an advantage that parents of the 1965 rubella babies didn't have. Hospitals now routinely test the hearing of the newborn with various electronic devices. If that had been done during the last rubella epidemic, many of today's deaf children would be far better off.

"There are critical time periods. Unless you reach a deaf child when he is very young, you may further limit his capacity to learn and fit into society," says Kay Horton, chief of the language department of the Bill Wilkerson Hearing and Speech Center in Nashville. She and other experts say parents of some of the rubella babies didn't know the children were deaf until they were two years old or older.

RISE IN ENROLLMENT

The rubella babies' hearing impairments range from moderate to severe. The thousands of these children with serious problems are now enrolled—or trying to enroll—in the nation's 1,180 schools and preschool facilities for the deaf. In all, these schools enrolled about 44,000 students in 1969, up from 32,000 in 1964.

At some schools, enrollment has risen nearly tenfold in recent years as a result of the rubella children. This year, for instance, the number of preschoolers at the San Francisco Hearing and Speech Center soared to 107, up from an average of 12 children before the epidemic. The New York City School for the Deaf, where preschool enrollment has jumped to 193 from 65 in 1965, recently introduced half-day double sessions.

Once a child is admitted to a special school, he is hooked up, plugged in and turned on with various science fiction-like devices. The wealth of new electronic equipment is one of the few advantages that the young rubella children have over deaf youngsters of the past. They are given new hearing aids that can be worn in all kinds of situations—on the playground, for instance—and that also bring them a wider range of sound. Oscilloscopes enable them to watch sound gradations on TV-like screens and thus better control their voices. Videotapes enable them to watch themselves when they speak and thus better control their sometimes wild gyrations.

DANCES AND BASKETBALL GAMES

Typical of the schools is the Clarke School for the Deaf, a private, residential school founded 103 years ago in Massachusetts. A close look at Clarke reveals much about the problems of educating the deaf.

Situated on a bucolic 30-acre hillside overlooking Northampton, Clarke tries hard to resemble a school for ordinary children. The

220 children, once totally isolated, now mingle freely with townspeople. Students participate in sports and cultivate the social graces. Clarke's basketball team regularly plays teams from local high schools (breaks are indicated by unusually loud buzzers and by flashing red lights). Older students attend dances. (They can't hear the music but pick up the vibrations.)

Most of Clarke's students are between six and 17 years old. They were lucky to get in—the school has room for only about 50% of the applicants—and their education is costing \$4,000 a year. (The students come from around the country, and their home states often pick up part or all of the bill; the school has scholarship funds that help students, too.) The fee is rising to \$5,000 next fall. When the Clarke students graduate at age 17, it is hoped their speech will be good enough to let them enter normal high schools as freshmen.

Clarke founded oralism—the lip-reading movement—for the deaf in America. School officials feel strongly that lip-reading is the best way for deaf people to get along in the world. "Our job is to equip deaf youngsters for the hearing world. You can't do this with manual techniques, which tend to isolate deaf persons from outside contacts," asserts George T. Pratt, president of the school. (Mr. Pratt is not deaf and neither are any of the 50 teachers at the school.)

Most schools for the deaf favor the oral approach, in which youngsters first learn to read lips and then to mimic the action and try to speak like normal children. But critics say this deprives the deaf of their "natural and normal" language—sign language. Also, critics cite a 1969 study at Chicago hospitals that blamed the heavy emphasis on lip-reading for poor scholastic achievement among the deaf.

McCay Vernon, professor of psychology at Western Maryland College in Westminster, contends that few deaf persons can truly master lip-reading and speaking. Those who can't, he asserts, remain "social isolates" all their lives because of their inability to communicate. He maintains that "most deaf youngsters drop out of school at ages 14 to 17, functionally illiterate and unable to speak or use the language of signs." He says the main problem is that so many English sounds look alike that accurate lip-reading is almost impossible.

LEARNING TO SPEAK

Most critics favor combining all methods in a single program, an approach already followed by some schools. In Washington, Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world, practices "total communication" in which sign language and oral techniques are used together.

But advocates of oral training, such as the people at the Clarke school, argue that the combination doesn't work because youngsters tend to become dependent on the simpler manual methods, and, as a result, never learn to speak. The oralists reject the criticism of their methods and contend that their technique is getting better all the time as new equipment becomes available to help children learn to read lips and speak.

Normal children learn to speak by imitating the sounds of others. Deaf children, of course, can't hear these sounds, so at Clarke and other schools that believe in oralism the deaf children rely on powerful earphones or hearing aids. These still don't enable most youths to hear normally—or even close to normally—but they do at least let them hear some sounds. The teacher then tries to get the youngster to watch the lip movements and facial expressions of those about him. Eventually, the teacher hopes, the child will begin to imitate, however imperfectly, the movements in an attempt to express himself.

To speed the process, some schools use phonetic symbols. They also use cards that illustrate the manner and production of

various sounds and models and diagrams that show the position and movement of speech organs. In time, children are taught vocabulary, multiple meanings of words and abstractions that are difficult to illustrate, such as hate and love.

Even when youngsters emit sounds resembling speech, they have a long way to go. "Many deaf children mimic their teachers in an exaggerated way. They try so hard to emphasize their words, they inadvertently wave their hands and bob their heads a lot," says Ralph White, audiovisual director at the Clarke school. Clarke has solved this problem by installing videotape machines that enable youngsters to see themselves making the unnecessary, wild festiculations.

Many schools hope to motivate youngsters to improve their oral performance through closed-circuit TV shows in which the students star. At Clarke, students recently wrote and acted out a Walter Cronkite-type newscast, complete with an anchorman and roving reporters. At 10 o'clock one recent morning, classes were interrupted for the five-minute newscast, which brought a roundup of local news, weather and sports and even a commercial for a fictitious hearing aid.

"Reporters will have to do well or the students viewing won't be able to read their lips," says Mr. White. "So you can bet they'll be motivated, because if they do poorly they'll get a terrible ribbing."

HELP FROM TINY TIM

One big problem after the youngsters learn to speak is that they tend to talk in a falsetto that is unpleasant to the ears of normal hearers. To get youngsters to speak in a more natural way, the Lexington School for the Deaf in New York uses a variety of techniques. Among other things, it has a youngster speak in front of a contraption in which 12 light bulbs are placed in a vertical row. As the voice ranges, different numbers of lights light up; if he lights up nine, he knows he is speaking properly.

But just getting some youngsters to speak at all can be the biggest problem. This year Lexington discovered it could spark chatter by mixing deaf preschoolers with normal children from the neighborhood. The preschoolers quickly acquired words like "hey" and "yeah" and, according to a teacher, sounded a lot more like typical kids. Another teacher found that deaf preschoolers became downright gabby after listening to highly amplified records of the Beatles and Tiny Tim.

"Tiny Tim is good because his voice has so many variations," says Marjorie Held, a Lexington teacher. "After hearing him, even babies begin making bubbly sounds of their own."

FOURTH ANNUAL DRIVER EXCELLENCE NATIONAL FINALS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 and 23, the city of Detroit hosted the fourth annual driver excellence national finals sponsored by AMVETS, the American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, and the Dodge Corp. I am particularly impressed by this program. It is wonderful that the men who found their comradeship in war have turned in peace to the saving of lives through driver excellence. It is also a pleasure to see the good kids rewarded. I had the honor of addressing

the awards banquet on May 23 at the Ponchartrain Hotel and to be given the opportunity then of meeting the many people involved as well as learning more about the driver excellence program, which has been established to promote certain standards of excellence in driving among our population and to foster greater safety on our Nation's roadways.

At this time, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an AMVETS press release related to the competition program and the winner of the finals, Ron Breitwisch, of Wisconsin, as well as a memorandum report about the AMVETS-Dodge "Operation D. E." traffic safety van:

NATIONAL DRIVER EXCELLENCE CHAMP DINES WITH TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A 17-year-old Manitowoc, Wisconsin youth was the honored guest at a special luncheon here, Tuesday, June 2, with the Secretary of Transportation of the United States, John A. Volpe.

Ron Breitwisch, winner of the AMVETS-Dodge National "Driver Excellence" Finals in Detroit, Michigan last week, was extended the invitation in a special telegram from Secretary Volpe following the final competition.

Young Breitwisch and his parents were joined by AMVETS National Commander Robert B. Gomulinski of Fraser, Mich. and Byron J. Nichols, Vice President of Chrysler Corporation, at the Capitol Hill luncheon in Secretary Volpe's private dining room in the Transportation Building.

Young Breitwisch, a Ham radio operator and honor student, won his title in the final competition at Detroit May 23.

He received a new Dodge Challenger and a \$1,000 scholarship as the top driver among his fellow state champions. Second place winner Robert Stander, of Grand Rapids, Michigan and third place winner Donald C. Smith of Washington, D.C. both received \$1,000 scholarships.

Edward and Ethel Breitwisch, the champion's parents, were on hand to watch their son glow in the winner's circle following the six hour driving event.

Breitwisch, who makes his home at 1622-A Division Street, is a junior at Lincoln High School. He was named to the National Honor Society last week. Following graduation he plans to study electrical engineering at the University of Wisconsin.

State "Driver Excellence" champions from across the nation competed in Detroit May 22-23 for more than five thousand dollars in scholarships and prizes.

The driving skill event brought the top high school driver education graduates into final competition in a five phase program designed to test motoring law and driving theory, automobile handling abilities, traffic driving expertise, and emergency vehicle control. The proper use of safety equipment available in the car is a factor in both the state and national events.

The AMVETS-Dodge Driver Excellence program uses a complicated handling, braking and vehicle maneuvering course for the state eliminations. It graduates to a five phase complex competition at the national level.

The national program, called Operation Driver Excellence, is staged as a cooperative effort between the American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Viet Nam (AMVETS) and the Dodge Division of Chrysler Corporation.

The finalists secured berths in the national event by winning state competitions over their fellow driver education graduates from a group of nearly a quarter of a million eligible participants.

Candidates for the state competitions are designated by the head of their high school

driver education departments. The state eliminations are carried out under the direction of local police authorities with the national event conducted in cooperation with the Michigan State and Detroit police departments.

The program was designed to point up the need for better driver licensing procedures and the importance of improved automobile handling abilities by drivers in present day motoring activity.

The proper use of the safety equipment available in the car is a factor in both state and national events. Penalty points are assessed if the contestant does not carry out such practices as fastening seat belts, locking doors, adjusting mirrors, etc.

In the national event, held at the civic center complex in Detroit, the driver education graduates were given written examinations in the first phase of the program. This is designed to test their knowledge of motoring law and driving theory.

The second phase is a closed course event, similar to the state competition, designed to test handling, stopping and parking abilities on an elapsed time basis.

The third phase of the national event is made up to test the contestants driving expertise under actual traffic conditions. With a police officer acting as judge, the student competitor is put through a predetermined course involving surface street, intersection and thruway traffic problems.

The fourth and fifth phases concern the handling of a vehicle in emergency situations. This is carried out through a panic stop and an emergency evasion test.

In the panic stop, the contestant builds the car speed to a predetermined figure and then at a surprise signal locks the brakes and exhibits his ability to control the car in a skidding situation.

The emergency evasion phase of the program involves the contestants' ability to make a quick, forced evasion maneuver and maintain control of a vehicle.

This is carried out by the student driving into three traffic lanes. Each lane has a light poised over it. When the student builds the speed of the car to a predetermined figure one of the lights become green . . . the contestant must put the car in the green lane from a predetermined speed and in a specified minimum distance. This activity simulates the avoidance of a sudden highway lane blockage through accident or obstacle.

AMVETS-DODGE "OPERATION D.E." TRAFFIC SAFETY VAN

The AMVETS-DODGE traffic safety van, from January 1969, to May, 1970, has visited cities in 22 states, traveling in excess of 30,000 miles. During this time, we have endeavored to gather traffic safety facts, as they relate to the findings and statistics of Highway Safety Program Standards prepared by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Traffic safety is a subject of vital interest in all parts of the country. In almost every state, interviews with Traffic Safety Directors and law enforcement officers indicate intensive studies are being conducted to determine causes of accidents, including whether or not fatalities resulted from vehicle equipment, inadequate traffic controls or driver error, with special attention to high accident areas.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM STANDARD 6—CODES AND LAWS—PURPOSE

"To eliminate all major variations in traffic codes, laws and ordinances on given aspects of highway safety among political subdivisions in a State, to increase the compatibility of these ordinances with a unified overall State policy on traffic safety codes and laws and to further the adoption of appropriate aspects of the Rules of the Road section of the Uniform Vehicle Code."

Extensive interstate travel reveals that road laning and information signs are generally uniform on turnpikes, tollroads and freeways so that, although requiring skill and concentration, such travel is often easier than "in-town" driving, where differences in traffic regulations, traffic signal placement and design, parking restrictions and poorly marked street signs confuse and distract. This is particularly apparent in resort areas where visitors from many states drive under varying sets of rules, creating problems which could be solved through enactment of uniform traffic regulations, vehicle inspection, equipment requirements and licensing laws.

Vehicle equipment

Optional equipment in most states includes seat belts, electric turn signals and, in Texas, windshield wipers.

Some states require this equipment only in later car models and most, as a matter of common sense, recommend the use of hand signals during the daylight hours.

Although not always required equipment, it is becoming unusual to see drivers—and passengers—not using seat belts. Campaigns by veterans organizations and civic groups, perhaps more than statistics, have made Americans conscious of the need for greater protective measures. The AMVET seat belt drive, for instance, involved not only AMVET members but their families and entire communities, with, of course, safety as the theme of the campaign. Following initial impact, drivers have found that the use of a secure seat belt eases driving fatigue and have developed an almost unconscious habit of fastening seat belts.

Licensing laws

There is an apparent need for continuing driver education, periodic re-testing and physical examination after a certain age. Quite often, the automobile traveling the wrong way on the highway is piloted by a "senior citizen" whose failing eyesight prevented his seeing directional signs and road markings.

Few states have compulsory examination after the initial testing. Some have provision for this procedure but do not implement it, until damage has been unnecessarily inflicted.

One 80 year old Miami, Florida, man was found to have total paralysis of the legs and operated his car, raising and lowering his foot, by pulling or pushing on his trouser leg. He had driven daily for many, many years, renewing his driver's license as required, without ever having to furnish proof of his mental or physical ability to operate a motor vehicle.

An almost blind man in St. Petersburg, Florida, drove with the aid of his elderly wife, who could not drive but directed her husband when to turn or stop.

These, of course, may be isolated cases, but can one really know where that driver might appear? Defensive driving technique is not always the answer in such instances.

DRIVER EDUCATION

In its travels, the traffic safety van was visited by hundreds of high school students. These young people, whose present life and future hopes and plans are, necessarily, so different from that of our generation, seem to have a much greater awareness of the potential danger of today's high speed roads and vehicles. They take great pride in learning to be safe and skillful drivers.

It was found that in the cities requiring attendance by traffic law offenders at traffic courts to observe, first hand, results of traffic violations, there were fewer repeat offenders, particularly among the young people. In some states, application for restoration of revoked or suspended licenses may be granted only after successful completion of an intensive driver education course.

In every high school visited, serious attention is given to the driver education course. Schools not offering this course, transport students to other schools for this purpose.

CONCLUSION

We do not hold, certainly, that all elderly people are poor or unsafe drivers, or that all young people are faultless. However, physical impairment, slower reflexes and, in some cases, mental confusion caused by advanced years can and should be detected before the renewal of drivers' licenses. This can only be accomplished through periodic re-testing and AMVETS would not be adverse to pressing for this type of legislation.

These tours have impressed upon us the great need for uniform traffic codes and laws in all states, as well as vehicle inspection and equipment regulations.

In this memorandum report, we have commented briefly on only a few points which we felt might be of interest or constitute special driving problems.

As, daily, more cars move onto our streets and highways, these problems are multiplied many times and the subject of traffic safety becomes of paramount importance.

AMVETS and Dodge, through "Operation D.E." (Driver Excellence) are attempting to do their part in helping to educate our driving public in the need for greater safety measures in all areas and are constantly searching for ways to improve and expand a program which has gained such wide and immediate acceptance.

A TELEGRAM SENT TO FITCHBURG, MASS., LAW DAY EXERCISES FROM HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, most regrettably, it was not possible for me to leave the House to attend the impressive Law Day exercises conducted at Fitchburg, Mass., courthouse on May 1, 1970. It would have been a special honor and privilege for me to attend.

However, in response to the very gracious invitation of my dear, greatly esteemed and distinguished friend, State Senator Joseph D. Ward, I sent the following telegram to the distinguished assemblage so fittingly celebrating the day in this great and beautiful city:

APRIL 30, 1970.

HON. JOSEPH D. WARD,
Ward, Bird & Donovan,
Attorneys at Law,
Fitchburg, Mass.:

Am very thankful to you and greatly honored for your kind invitation to make Law Day address this Friday at the Fitchburg Courthouse. Unfortunately, because of legislative situation here, it will not be possible for me to be with you for what I know will be a most rewarding and inspiring occasion.

Law Day is a timely reminder for all Americans to consider and recognize with gratitude the cherished freedoms that are ours under the Rule of Law.

This nation was founded upon the principle that ours is a government of law by men chosen by the people, with the result that our democracy has been preserved by collective action and strengthened to uphold its values in periods of strife and turmoil and at all other times.

Let us make this Law Day 1970 a day of remembrance of the great sacrifices which have been made to guarantee and sustain individual freedom. Let this memorable day which the leadership and people of Fitchburg celebrate with such profound loyalty and devotion to our beloved country, renew our spirit of dedication to our blessed freedoms, and serve as a reminder that in these days of turbulence and upset, it is for all of us to recognize and honor the obligation of all citizens to obey our laws, respect the rights of others and maintain the stability and order of our communities, the security of our homes and the liberties and rights of our citizens and all those living among us.

Obedience to the majesty of the law, respect for the individual rights of the people, regardless of race, class or creed, and unswerving determination at all costs to guard our heritage with renewed vigor, courage, and in every way that may be necessary, will assure the nation, and prove to the world, our high purpose to maintain, promote and enrich our great free system against all those who would destroy it.

Heartiest congratulations upon your most appropriate, impressive exercises on Law Day, and warm greetings, regards and best wishes to all.

Phil

Congressman PHILIP P. PHILBIN.

THE DELANEY ANTICANCER AMENDMENT

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, according to a story in this morning's press, the administration has mapped a legislative strategy to modify the so-called Delaney anticancer clause, which was enacted on September 6, 1958, as Public Law 85-929.

This legislation prohibits the use of any cancer-inducing chemical additive in food. Specifically, it provides that—

No additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal.

This particular provision followed the recommendation of the International Union Against Cancer at its symposium in Rome in August 1956. At that time, members of the conference, consisting of over 40 cancer experts from some 21 countries, unanimously recommended that, as a basis for active cancer prevention, the proper authorities of various countries promulgate and enact adequate rules and regulations prohibiting the addition to food of substances found to induce cancer. After discussing this recommendation with a number of eminent cancer experts in the United States, and having their strong support, I recommended this amendment.

With regard to reported plans to modify this legislation, I would like to share with my colleagues, and others who read the RECORD, the views expressed in a letter I recently received from Miss Elise Jerard, chairman of the Independent Phi Beta Kappa Environmental Study Group. The letter follows:

INDEPENDENT PHI BETA KAPPA ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP, AND CITIZENS RIGHTS COMMITTEE.

New York, N.Y., June 3, 1970.

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DELANEY: According to Food Chemical News, officials in high places have publicly described the so-called Delaney or "Anti-Cancer Clause" in the Food Law as "ridiculous," have claimed that it would make us "limited vegetarians" if enforced and that it is "time to think of establishing safe tolerances" for substances found capable of inducing cancer. The phrase "limited vegetarians" is particularly confusing inasmuch as our vegetables contain residues of pesticides which have been found in tests to induce cancer, as well as our meats, fish, eggs, cheese and even, in traces, our milk.

While it is true that we cannot scrap all those foodstuffs during the period when such dubious additives will—one hopes—be phased out of use, certainly, in the opinion of our members who include cancer experts and after the prolonged research of our Phi Beta Kappa members, there seems to be no excuse for killing or "nibbling to death" with modifications the "Anti-Cancer Clause" which can offer, now and in the future, protection against the invasion of our diet by cancer-inciting chemicals.

Moreover, there is clear evidence that to establish "safe tolerances" would constitute a giant backward step in public protection—offered in the name of science.

WHY CANCER IS IN A CLASS BY ITSELF

Cancer testing is unique because cancer develops slowly and, as the experts eloquently put it, silently. In dogs tests may take 7 or 8 years to show cancer while in humans there may be no manifestations of the malignancy for 15 to 25 years. In general, once the malignant process has been established it is irreversible. Since a single dose of a cancer-causing chemical or repeated very small doses have been shown to incite cancer the present push for so-called "safe tolerances" would gravely jeopardize a public which has already been subjected to a multiplicity of serious hazards.

Dr. Roy Newton, former Vice President in Charge of Technical Operations at Swift and Company, characterized certain misleading arguments for permissiveness in the use of additives as dangerous "confusers."

We should like to cite a few of them which now are rampant in respect to the "Anti-Cancer Clause."

THE CONFUSERS

The Claim.—Our advanced technology can now measure unprecedentedly slight amounts of chemicals in food. Therefore, "zero tolerance" no longer has meaning.

The Facts.—This is irrelevant. Because we can measure substances already present in food does not mean that we need to introduce into food small amounts of chemicals known to be capable of inducing cancer. If so-called "safe tolerances" were established they would apply not to one food item but possibly to hundreds or as Dr. William Stewart has suggested, even to a thousand.

The Claim.—Some natural substances may contain constituents which chemically could be suspected of inciting cancer. Are we going to throw them out of the diet?

The Facts.—The so-called Delaney Clause or "Anti-Cancer Clause" was devised for protection against synthetic additives, foreign to human biology, and generally never consumed by man on earth.

The Claim.—Even familiar substances like sugar have been found to cause cancer in tests—so what is proven by them?

The Facts.—Competent cancer researchers have been unable to verify that experiment. Dr. W. C. Hueper, a member of our

Committee on Environmental Contamination and emeritus Environmental Cancer Chief of the National Cancer Institute, as well as several other top-notch scientists in this country and abroad, tried to repeat the test reported by a Japanese team but did not attain the results with sugar. It was concluded that impurities must have been responsible for the significant number of cancers elicited.

The Claim.—Large doses are used in cancer tests. They have nothing to tell us about the small amounts of the compounds which human beings will ingest.

The Facts.—In all food and drug tests large amounts are used, first, because animals are short-lived and expensive and, second, because there must be a factor of safety to protect humans—and individuals differ in some respects by a factor of 100 and in others, as shown by Dr. Roger Williams, by as much as a factor of 500. However, cancer tests are generally performed not only with high doses, but also with medium and low concentrations.

Why so much objection to large doses in cancer tests when the risk is unique and extremely grave? A negative finding in a test on animals does not assure safety for humans; but a positive result is a warning. Why the willingness to discount the warning when cancerization is a terrible fate which overtakes about one-fourth of the population?

The Claim.—If the skin of a cancer-prone mouse is painted with a chemical compound and cancer develops, that substance would be banned by the Delaney Clause.

The Facts.—False. The tests are basically feeding tests. To round out the picture other methods are generally used. The evaluation by qualified experts is based on a wide clinical spectrum.

The Claim.—The Delaney Clause does not offer leeway for scientific judgment.

The Facts.—Nothing in the Clause prevents the most thorough scientific appraisal and evaluation.

What the Clause does provide is a check on recklessness and bias resulting from industrial pressures and priorities.

THE CLAIM ABOUT CYCLAMATES

Highly placed officials have also stated or implied that the crack-down on cyclamates occurred because of the rigidity of the "Anti-Cancer Clause"; also, that one would have to drink a grotesque amount of cyclamate-containing beverages "to get the dose that caused cancer in animals."

As pointed out by Consumers Research, cyclamates have been used as ingredients not only of soft drinks but of hundreds of food products, many of which could be ingested day after day—by persons in all states of health and susceptibility to cancer, a state which is not identifiable.

Furthermore, bladder cancers were caused not only, as claimed, with "a dose 50 times higher than normal human consumption" but also by the low level of 8 parts per million.

Cyclohexylamine, a highly dangerous breakdown product of cyclamates, was found in 40% of the subjects studied. Also, work in the Worcester Institute of Experimental Biology showed human chromosome damage by cyclamates, while FDA scientists found that the substance caused birth defects in animals.

In sum, cyclamates were established as carcinogenic at low concentration, as well as teratogenic.

THE CLAIM ABOUT THE CLAUSE AND THOSE CRANBERRIES

The "cranberry episode" is also frequently cited as an unfortunate effect of the Delaney Clause. However, HEW Secretary Arthur Flemming, seeking an "Anti-Cancer Clause" in the 1960 legislation regulating food dyes,

disclosed at a hearing of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee some rarely mentioned details of the ban on aminotriazole.

American Cyanamid Co. had asked registration of the pesticide for soy beans, apples and cranberries, on a no-residue basis. Amchem Products Co. submitted a petition seeking a residue tolerance. Cranberry growers jumped the gun by using aminotriazole before it was registered or adequate tests had been performed.

In May, 1959, the FDA Division of Pharmacology reported: "The requested tolerance of 1 p.p.m. for apples, pears and cranberries should not be established, as the pathological evidence shows undoubtedly that this compound is a carcinogen . . . aminotriazole caused cancer in rats and cats at high and medium and low doses (10 p.p.m.) in feeding tests . . . a no-effect level was not found."

Three million pounds of cranberries were found to be contaminated. The FDA tested and cleared a total of 33.6 million pounds and released them to the market labeled "Examined and passed by the Food and Drug Administration." Despite the fact that the product was unjustifiably used, the industry was compensated at the taxpayers' expense. In the Thanksgiving season an indeterminate number of persons susceptible to cancer—or people with cancers—could have consumed a relatively large amount of cranberries contaminated by a compound which had caused cancer in animals at the very low dosage of 10 p.p.m.

THE SYNTHETIC FEMALE HORMONE

The ban on stilbestrol, used for rapid fattening of poultry, has likewise been blamed on the "unscientific" Delaney Clause. Prudent scientists, however, backed the move. Dr. Roy Herz, Chief of the Branch of Endocrinology of the National Cancer Institute, stated, after residues of the hormone had been found in the livers of treated poultry and parts beneath the skin: "Stilbestrol is known to produce a variety of tumors in several species after prolonged exposure . . . in rare cases cancers have developed in (human) patients after prolonged use of stilbestrol. . . . It is therefore desirable to eliminate the hazard, no matter how small the dosage, of continued consumption of this material in one's diet for years of one's life."

THE SCIENTIFIC RATIONALE OF THE "ANTI-CANCER CLAUSE" AS PRESENTED BY THE U.S. NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The chief points of an extensive document prepared for HEW Secretary Flemming by scientists of the National Cancer Institute are as follows: (1) Cancer can be caused by very small doses of carcinogenic agents. (2) Not all members of the exposed population are expected to develop cancer but those most susceptible cannot be identified. (3) Even a powerful carcinogen requires years in man to become evident (often 15-25 years). (4) No change need be recognized in the organs or tissues destined to become cancerous before the cancer appears. (5) Small doses frequently repeated have been most effective in cancerization. (6) Young animals have been most susceptible. (7) No one can tell how much or how little of a carcinogen will be required to produce cancer in any human being, nor how long it will take for the cancer to develop. (8) The effect of chemical carcinogens can be markedly increased by other compounds (co-carcinogens). (9) The evidence suggests the irreversibility of the carcinogenic process, once it has been initiated, and further suggests a cumulative effect. (10) Every chemical compound found to cause cancer in man has produced cancer in one or more species of animals, though not necessarily in the same sites. (11) Cancer is induced by ionizing radiation. Radioactivity may be ingested with

food. (12) It must be noted that there are numerous simultaneous exposures to carcinogens. (13) No "safe tolerance", in the light of complexities and knowledge, can be established for a carcinogen—for human beings.

(See: "The Role Of Certain Chemicals And Physical Agents In The Causation Of Cancer"; G. Borouh Mider, Associate Director of Research, National Cancer Institute)

THE BAN ON CARCINOGENIC FOOD ADDITIVES BY THE INTERNATIONAL UNION AGAINST CANCER

The International Union Against Cancer first published its findings and Resolutions in regard to food additives in 1957 in the *Acta Unio Internationalist Contra Cancrum* (13,195) and has continued to affirm the position which influenced the introduction and wording of the so-called Delaney Clause.

The adoption of this Clause is supported by distinguished scientists and physicians, including Dr. Alton Ochsner, eminent cancer surgeon and Director of the Ochsner Foundation and Clinic, a past President of the American Cancer Society.

"Safe Dose and the Delaney Clause" From a Chapter on Environmental Cancer in the *Forthcoming Lawyer's Medical Encyclopedia* by Dr. W. C. Hueper, Recipient of the Rosenthal Medal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Awarded a WHO Fellowship for Research in Cancer and Allied Diseases:

"The adoption of a 'safe dose' of carcinogens would be bound to result in an increased exposure of the population to environmental carcinogens. . . . The 'safe dose' would be set in the final analysis at an arbitrary level, since the available methodology does not permit the determination on which a 'safe dose' can be reliably based. It would accommodate mainly industrial and commercial interests at the expense of the exposed population which would pay the price with cancerous disease, death and excessive medical expenses."

Cannot the FDA protect us from cancer risks without an anti-cancer clause? Cannot consultation with scientific advisory boards assure such protection?

The record is not entirely reassuring. To cite two instances:

Twenty years of correspondence between the FDA and manufacturers of selenium-containing pesticides did not result in a ban, although the Chief Pharmacologist testified that these pesticides have the capacity to penetrate the peel of fruit and enter the body (the principal product being apples). In tests, even at low dosage, animals were prolongedly symptomless and eventually manifested cancers which proved fatal.

In the aramite case, this useful miticide was used for more than twenty kinds of fruits and vegetables, some consumed raw. After liver cancers were found in tests by the FDA, a ban on the product was ordered. United Rubber Company, which manufactured the pesticide, asked consultation with the Scientific Advisory Committee. This Committee recommended that tests at a still lower dosage be performed for two more years. The FDA agreed, although not obliged to accept the recommendation. Accordingly, for two more years the American people consumed the residues of a pesticide which had caused cancer at low concentrations. When the still-lower dosage also elicited cancers the FDA finally banned the product from Interstate Commerce. A Memo from the Chief Pharmacologist observed that the recommended tests at a lower dosage would "not remove the onus that aramite is a known carcinogen." This and other instances would seem to indicate the need for an "Anti-Cancer Clause" in the Food Law.

SOME CLARIFYING SCIENTIFIC COMMENTS

Dr. Albert Tannenbaum, Medical Research Institute, Michael Reese Hospital:

"It is not possible unequivocally to establish 'safe tolerances' even for weak carcinogenic substances. It is possible (sometimes) in laboratory tests. Such data cannot be applied to the problem of man, subject over his lifetime to not only the same but many kinds of additives whose actions and effects are cumulative. . . . There is evidence that cancer-causing agents produce irreversible changes. The spirit and meaning of the Delaney Clause should be retained."

Dr. Howard L. Stewart, National Cancer Institute (Dr. Stewart is now serving as a consultant on the problems of the FDA):

(On the difference between toxic substances, in general, and cancer-causing compounds) "If not too badly damaged, cells may recover from toxic effects . . . but effects of carcinogens are definitely long-lasting if not permanent and the likelihood of cancer increases with repeated exposure of tissues to carcinogens."

"Publication 749 'Problems In The Evaluation Of Carcinogenic Hazard In The Use Of Food Additives' published by the National Academy of Sciences (Food Protection Committee) contains a good deal of useful information but also contains . . . insecure conclusions . . . (it) lists two 'justifications' for using carcinogens in food: if (1) values to the public are such that banning the use will constitute an important loss and hardship (2) there is no reasonable good carcinogenic alternative."

"These words sound like reasons to save money, to save work, neither of which are valid excuses to deliberately expose human beings to the risk of cancer."

"Carcinogens do not act directly only on exposed tissues. Carcinogens admitted by the gastro-intestinal tract may produce cancers in many sites other than the gastro-intestinal tract, e.g., lung, pancreas, mesenteric membrane, lymph nodes, salivary glands, brain, thyroid, ear duct, liver, kidney, uterus."

"The total carcinogenic load must be considered: exposure to ultraviolet light, radiation, radioactive substances in water and food, industrial wastes, exhaust from gasoline and diesel engines, tarred roads, medicine, arsenic, pesticides, herbicides, estrogen and so forth. . . . Accordingly, no safe dose of carcinogens can or should be set."

Dr. Martin Levin, Professor of Epidemiology, Roswell Park Institute (New York State Cancer Research Hospital):

"The question of evaluation is: Whether we want to place our major emphasis in the direction of health, safety—or on the maximum utilization of chemical additives."

With, to us, is the crux of the matter.

Sincerely,

ELISE JERARD, Chairman.

CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS' LATEST NEWSLETTER

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my latest newsletter which I am mailing to the residents of my congressional district.

The letter follows:

JUNE 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: This is another in a series of congressional reports as this year reaches the halfway point. Your views or comments are always welcome.

Cambodia—The President took a gamble in moving American troops into Cambodia, and I hope he succeeds.

Of course, only time will tell whether the military successes our forces seem to have achieved will be of lasting significance. Of course, I hope they are and that we are nearer to a just conclusion of the Indochina War.

Tampa port deepening—The \$102 million deepening of the main navigation channels of Tampa's port has been approved by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. The next step is approval by the Budget Bureau and the House Public Works Committee. I have contacted the President and alerted him to the importance of this project and have asked him to make every effort to see that the necessary funds are included in his budget for this project.

VA hospital—The new Veterans Administration hospital near the University of South Florida is proceeding on schedule and is expected to be completed by the fall of 1971. This \$19.5 million structure on a 22-acre tract will have 720 beds, including a 240-bed psychiatric wing. It will be a part of the \$60 million medical complex which will include the new University of South Florida medical school.

Tampa's airport tower—Tampa International's new multi-million dollar terminal complex will be completed late this year. Crucial to the safe operation of this enlarged facility will be a new and taller air control tower. Through follow-up work with the Federal Aviation Administration, we were able to have the \$1.37 million for this new tower included in this year's appropriations by Congress.

Local pollution control—A pollution crisis threatened Tampa Harbor several weeks ago when crude oil from two long-abandoned ships began to leak. By working with the Department of Justice, the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the Coast Guard, Senator Holland and I were able to get special pumps flown in and the oil has been removed by the Coast Guard.

Environment—This past April, I sponsored along with the students at the University of South Florida, a day-long seminar on the preservation and improvement of our environment. Such seminars help make us aware of the need for action in this important area. The federal government has a major responsibility for working on the problems of pollution.

Among the several bills which I have already introduced are proposals which would:

Establish national emission standards for clean air and provide penalties for failure to obey orders to cease and desist from pollution practices.

Eliminate lead from gasoline, thereby reducing air pollution from autos.

Require nationwide protective emission devices on auto and truck exhausts and emission limits which all autos would have to meet.

Establish a Congressional Committee on Environment and Technology to develop laws to control air, water and other environmental pollution.

Authorize the U.S. to help establish educational programs to promote understanding and support of activities to improve our ecological environment.

Improve the Manpower Act to provide for the training of specialists in the abatement of environmental pollution.

I also voted to appropriate \$800 million under the Federal Clean Water Act.

A study of the obnoxious odors in part of Tampa Bay was undertaken at my insistence by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and they have recommended measures to clean up the Bay.

The economy—Inflation and recession seem to be jointly with us. While prices still climb, unemployment also continues to climb. There has been a 45 percent increase

in unemployment over the past 17 months from January 1969 to May 1970. This represents 1.6 million additional jobless for a total in excess of four million unemployed. An unemployment rate of five percent means a loss in goods and services of \$45 billion annually. Interest rates on home mortgages continue at a record high level with no sign of decline. President Nixon's prophesied slim budget surplus for this year has also slipped into a deficit of approximately \$11 billion, and this even after Congress had cut his budget by \$6.3 billion. Once again the Congress has been asked by the Administration to increase the national debt by \$18 billion to \$395 billion.

What to do? Many experts now advise that selective wage, price and profit controls must be imposed. If our economy continues to slide into a recession while the cost of living soars, we will be facing some very tough decisions. Meanwhile, the President has the power, as yet unused, given to him by Congress last year, to control interest rates, credit and related economic factors.

Our uncertain economic condition is largely a result of our Indochina war which badly distorts our priorities by requiring an expenditure of around \$25 billion additional defense dollars each year.

Legislative activities—Seniority and secrecy are the two major vices of Congress. The first allows the same men to continue in powerful committee chairmanships solely because they have survived; and the latter shuts out both press and public from many committee meetings. These secret committee sessions are the main place where congressional policy is shaped. I have supported action to drastically curb both secrecy and seniority.

Other legislative activities I have supported include:

Testimony in support of a resolution to urge the President to use his economic powers to curb high interest rates, powers voted him by the 1969 session of Congress.

A personal appearance before the House Rules Committee, urging that the food stamp program be revamped to save \$276 million in duplicated administrative costs. Although the Administration at first opposed my suggestion, they now appear to favor it.

A Child Development Act to promote a "Good Start" in the development and education of the nation's children.

Bills to provide grants to local school systems for special courses in drug abuse, as well as teacher training for such courses and for more research into the effects of harmful drugs, including marijuana.

An amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that major metropolitan areas such as ours, will directly receive at least 50 percent of the federal anti-crime funds allocated to a state. This will put the federal anti-crime funds where the need is.

Ways and Means Committee actions—The Ways and Means Committee is one of the oldest and the most prestigious committees in Congress. I have the honor of being the second Floridian in the history of Congress to serve on this Committee.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have a role in writing all tax legislation, as well as in such matters as Social Security, Medicare and foreign trade policy. Our Committee has been in almost continuous session on such matters since early 1969. For seven months of that year, we worked on tax reform. We then approved, and the Congress passed, a revised tax law which will give most middle and lesser income taxpayers tax cuts of five to fifteen percent over the next two years. Those reforms are insufficient, however. We still have a tax law which taxes income from the average citizen's work on his job at a much higher rate than income from non-work sources. The federal tax laws are overly complex, and much more work is needed on them.

The Committee has also just completed a revision of the Social Security program as well as Medicare.

Starting next January 1, Social Security recipients will receive a five percent increase in their cash payments. This is in addition to the 15 percent hike approved by the Ways and Means Committee and Congress last year.

We adopted several new procedures to limit the soaring rise in costs of Medicare. I hope they work because the cost of this program has exceeded predictions.

Foreign trade—Our Committee is presently engaged in extensive foreign trade hearings. Foreign trade in this country amounts to about \$80 billion a year, and it is an important factor in our nation's economy.

We are presently hearing public witnesses on the matter of tariffs and import quotas. The garment, fruit and vegetable, and oil industries are among those who will be affected by the actions of our Committee.

America is the largest foreign trading nation in the world, and a healthy trade policy is essential to the well being of all of us. A healthy trading policy means to the consumer competitive prices as well as a broader range of products from which to select.

Students—All but a tiny minority of Americans reject violence as a method of political change. So do I.

Let me repeat what I have said before. I do not excuse nor condone violence by any group of whatever age or persuasion.

During the first week in May, our capital was visited by large numbers of students from all over the United States, some of whom were from Florida. Many students visited this office, and I am pleased to report that those with whom I met were level-headed, decent young Americans who were quite concerned with the problems we confront today.

Family activities—Martha remains quite active here in Washington as President of the Congressional Wives group for the 88th Congress. Additionally, she has hosted luncheons in the Capitol for wounded Vietnam war veterans.

Martha and our boys will be spending the summer in Florida, and I hope to get down there, too, whenever time will permit.

Report requests—I periodically send a legislative report to those persons who have asked to be placed on my mailing list. If you would like to be added to that list, please fill out the form below and send it back to me.

Sincerely,

SAM M. GIBBONS.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission is a welcome action, particularly during a period when consumerism and inflation are major topics of discussion.

For too long the Commission's operations have served as an unintended aid to industrial machinations. Companies under investigation by the FTC could count on several years of litigation and administrative procedures before any adverse action would be taken against them. During that time, these unscrupulous

companies were able to soak the public for profits on goods and services that would eventually be removed from the market.

In addition, the reorganization of its antitrust division should spell swift justice for those companies who seek to exploit the general welfare for personal gain. No more, I hope, will lengthy litigation and administrative procedures be a ticket for continued exploitation.

But the reorganization has implications in other than trade areas. The changes were instigated by a directive from President Nixon and is part of his overall objective to build a more efficient and responsive Federal bureaucracy during his term of office.

As the load of responsibility increases at the Federal level, new and innovative ideas will have to be implemented if the American governmental system is to remain responsive to and fully cognizant of the needs of the people.

Nor can we continue to depend on the seemingly unrequited flow of tax dollars to finance waste and inefficiency. Already we have reached—if not surpassed—the limits of taxpayer endurance.

The FTC changes, then, are very welcome from the point of view of its own operations, and whet the organizational appetite with the implication of possible far-reaching governmental restructuring in the future.

"ASSIGNMENT TO NEGLECT"—A CRUEL MISNOMER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the May 22 issue of Life magazine contained an article which has shocked and outraged millions of Americans. The article, entitled "Assignment to Neglect," described alleged conditions at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in the Bronx, N.Y., and in the VA hospital system. The impact of the article was to represent the care we afford our wounded veterans as medieval, inadequate, and even negligent.

This article is a disgrace, because it does a major disservice to the dedicated men and women who staff our 166 VA institutions, and because it inaccurately reports conditions within the VA system. One need only read the rational retort of Dr. A. M. Kleinman, director of the Kingsbridge veterans hospital, or the telegram of VA Administrator Donald Johnson to Life magazine, to see where the truth lies. Under the leave to include my remarks in the RECORD, therefore, I include their rebuttals to the distortions to truth pandered in the heinous Life article:

MAY 20, 1970.

From: Donald E. Johnson, Administrator, Veterans Administration central office, Washington, D.C.

Life magazine of May 22 carries an article on VA Medical Care. With its nearly nine million circulation the Publication reaches

every community in America and may lead to inquiries at your Station. Following for your information is the text of my telegram of this date to the Editor of Life.

From the obviously contrived cover page and staged hospital photographs right down to every biting word of the denunciatory narrative, the article in the May 22, 1970 issue of Life Magazine gives a totally distorted picture of Veterans Administration Medical Care.

Thus, it serves to needlessly alarm present and prospective patients to discredit the competent and dedicated staffs at VA's 166 Hospitals, and to make more difficult the recruitment of medical staff your article says we so sorely need.

The article describes the VA Hospital system as the biggest in the world, and yet in your zeal to condemn, you could not find one good word to say about any part of this vast program.

The reporter held a nearly 90-minute interview with me in my capacity as head of the VA. What survived of this in-depth interview was a single two-line sentence in the final article, and even this one sentence contribution was airily dismissed in the next sentence of the story.

Your staffers visited the Washington, D.C., VA Hospital on three separate occasions, talked freely to many patients including severely disabled Vietnam veterans, and shot scores of photographs, many of a 22-year-old Vietnam amputee in his treatment routine.

Could the fact that all of these veterans voluntarily praised the VA Medical care be the reason that not one word or one picture about these veterans appeared in Life?

Could it be that of the 800,000 veterans treated each year the one complaining patient featured by Life—who condemned his country as well as VA care—better fitted the story Life wanted to tell?

The truth is that each month VA Hospitals receive literally hundreds of unsolicited letters from veterans and their loved ones expressing gratitude for the excellent VA care these veterans received.

Life describes the VA system as a medical slum. Here are just a few facts about this so-called slum—facts that were given to Life, but withheld from its readers by the Magazine.

All of VA's 166 Hospitals are fully accredited by The Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation, which is composed of representatives of The American Medical Association, The American Hospital Association, The American College of Physicians, and The American College of Surgeons.

The basic VA Medical Care Budget for the current Fiscal Year of \$1,541,701,000 is by far the highest in all VA history. President Nixon has already asked Congress for \$210,000,000 more than even this record sum for the Fiscal Year starting next July 1. The extra money will permit the addition of more than 5,700 employees to our hospital staffs.

VA Hospitals are affiliated closely with nearly every major medical school in the nation, an invaluable partnership that permits VA to keep abreast of the best and most sophisticated medical care.

VA Hospital staffs are not only hard-working and completely dedicated to the proposition that our sick and disabled veterans will never be forgotten or neglected (as charged in the Life article), but include many of the real experts in American Medicine, more than 2,200 of VA's 5,100 physicians are Board Certified Specialists as the result of three to five years extra medical training.

All of this is not to say that the VA medical system cannot be improved just as every other medical program should seek improvement. We are committed to constant progress and improvement, for it is our goal to provide the very best possible medical care to every eligible veteran.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Bronx, N.Y., May 20, 1970.

Mr. THOMAS GRIFFITH,
Editor, *Life Magazine*, Time and Life Building,
Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: In the interest of truth and in the hope of allaying the fears and deep concern which have been unjustifiably aroused in the American public by the article, "Assignment to Neglect", May 22, 1970, I trust that you will publish this letter. My comments are directed to the quality of care received by the spinal cord injury patients who are the subjects of the article, but they apply to our other patients as well.

The title "Assignment to Neglect" is a cruel misnomer. Our patients are far from neglected. Considering the handicaps under which we work, the quality of care which our patients receive should be classed as "superb"—but we class it only as "good" because of certain handicaps. Yes, we do have shortcomings. The buildings are old, the physical layout of the wards is inefficient, space is limited, and personnel is small in numbers but enormously large in dedication and devotion.

Let us examine every picture of the article. Of the twelve patients shown about whom something is written, six are of Marke Dumpert. Some time ago Marke Dumpert was transferred to another hospital at his own insistent request. Shortly after his arrival there, he pleaded with us to take him back, which we did.

The cover shows Marke Dumpert as apparently very depressed. On page 25 Dumpert is pictured waiting "helplessly to be dried." Actually he had been wheeled under the shower by a nursing assistant assigned to this task, and after he had been partly lathered with soap, the assistant was asked to step aside by the photographer who wished to take this picture. The fact is that no patient is left under the shower after completion of the bath. All are wheeled away and dried immediately. This picture, like the others to be described, are posed to illustrate a point, but the point illustrated is untruthful as in this instance, or a partial or distorted truth in others.

The picture on page 25 shows quadriplegic patients (patients who are paralyzed in all four extremities) lying on Stryker frames in the enema room. The caption states that they "wait up to four hours to be attended by a single aide." This is a misrepresentation of the facts. These patients are given their enemas promptly after arrival in the enema room. However, unlike normal people who expel bowel contents shortly after receiving an enema, it takes most of these patients from one to two hours to do this. In a few patients the process may take up to three hours, very rarely four hours. And what are the patients doing during this interval? Some of them doze, others chat with one another, and still others may day dream. The patients may be left alone for short periods of time because they are securely strapped to the frames.

On page 29 Marke Dumpert is shown in three poses. In the bottom two he is shown being treated by therapists. The caption reads "hospital aides strap him into a brace so he can stand." This is a partial truth. The clinic in which this picture was posed is known as the ADL Clinic: i.e., activities of daily living are taught here. This is the first and in many respects perhaps one of the most important phases of rehabilitation of paralyzed patients when they are permitted to get out of bed. Many patients are fearful and must be given steady and repeated encouragement to make the physical effort. Dumpert was one of these but one of our nurses spent untold hours of her own time to encouraging him to make the attempt. He finally did, and now attends this clinic and others regularly. This picture then, although posed, reflects a truth about the care which our patients

receive, but no one can tell from the caption that this treatment is excellent. It might have been a gracious and truthful gesture in the direction of some of the positives of VA care had had the caption so indicated.

The picture on page 30 shows a patient lying almost naked in bed. Also shown is another patient lying on a stretcher. The caption reads: "In a partitionless ward of the Bronx VA Hospital a disarray of dirty linen is allowed to pile up around a quadriplegic's bed while the patient himself lies naked, unable to clothe himself after a shower." The whole thing was posed. The patient is Marke Dumpert who was taken to his bed after the shower previously interrupted was completed. Every bed has a cubicle curtain which is drawn when the patient is being cared for. In this instance, at the direction of the photographer, all of the cubicle curtains were drawn back out of sight of the camera lens. The "dirty linen" consists of the sheet which had covered the patient when he was being wheeled back from the shower room plus a number of clean pillows. Paralyzed patients need many pillows to be placed around them by nursing personnel for proper body positioning and for both comfort and convenience.

The other patient shown in the same picture, a World War II veteran, was asleep when he was photographed. He resents bitterly the fact that he was photographed without his knowledge or consent. If awake, he says that he would have refused to give permission. He says he feels that the Bronx VA has saved his life, and is thankful for the care which he receives here.

The upper picture on page 31 shows a sleeping patient and, on the floor beside him, a mouse caught in a trap. We do not use traps in our campaign against mice which admittedly we do have. We use tested and approved methods for mice control. Construction of buildings in the vicinity of the hospital, and some construction on the hospital grounds involving excavation tend to chase field mice into the buildings.

With respect to rats, there has been only one complaint made by a patient. This occurred last August. There have been no subsequent complaints. One of our experts states categorically that mice and rats do not exist together. If there are mice, there are no rats, and vice versa. What it may have been is a black squirrel. We have many squirrels on our park-like grounds, some gray, others black. One of the latter could have invaded the hospital.

The bottom picture on page 31 shows "a totally crippled patient who must depend on a buddy who still has the use of his arms to get a sheet thrown over him." This is totally misleading. Quadriplegic patients have lost the inner body controls of temperature which normal people have. They frequently prefer to remain with as few coverings as possible, and we permit this inside the wards. The throwing of the sheet over the patient was the photographer's idea.

The final picture on pages 32 and 33 shows the enema room. On the right are two patients on Stryker frames while between them a hemiplegic patient in a wheel chair is giving a cigarette to quadriplegic patient Andrew Kmetz. The caption states that the patients are waiting for treatment. This is not true. Kmetz was dozing while the photographer was taking pictures of him. He awoke as Frank Stopiello in the wheel chair was wheeled in to pose, giving Kmetz the cigarette. Stopiello was an overnight patient who had been admitted for the annual complete checkup which we give to all of our ex-patients, and he himself was not in need of an enema. Kmetz was disturbed at the invasion of his privacy. Stopiello is one of hundreds of paralyzed patients in our follow-up program. These patients have been rehabilitated to a full life in their communities and they return to

us by appointment once a year for a complete checkup. Is this neglect?

The left side of the same picture shows several trash cans, one of them seemingly bulging with trash. The latter can is protruding into the area occupied by the patients. The caption reads, "Because of overcrowding, they must share a corner with trash cans." The cans are needed in the room for disposal of the trash which accumulates in the process of giving and evacuation of enemas and subsequent cleaning up of the patients. However, the trash cans are segregated to one side of the large room, and a curtain separates them from the patient area. This curtain was pushed back and the overloaded can pushed towards the patient for misleading photographic effect.

I began this letter by expressing the hope that you would publish it in the interest of truth and in the hope of allaying the fears and deep concern which have been unjustifiably aroused. In concluding I wish to express my fear and concern that the article may lead to the title "Assignment to Neglect" becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. The staff on the spinal cord injury wards who work so hard with such difficult patients to achieve the wonderful results that they do have become thoroughly disheartened by the article. Staffing these wards has always been difficult, people frequently refusing to accept assignments there. As attrition occurs, it may become even more difficult to recruit replacements. Without an experienced staff, these patients cannot be treated. Neglect, now untrue, may become true later. But I have faith in the spiritual strength of our staff and in their ability to overcome their disheartenment. I also know that sensationalism in the press usually has only short term effects. I hope that your article will prove to be no exception to the rule.

Yours truly,

A. M. KLEINMAN, M.D.,
Hospital Director.

HIGH INTEREST RATES—INFLATION—UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has become more and more program-oriented and less and less people-oriented. Decisions are made with greater concern for a political gain, than for the effect on the lives of human beings.

In no area is this more apparent than the economy. The results of the current policy are readily seen and illustrate the priorities of the administration. First, let us consider the policy; second, we will consider the results; and finally, we will suggest corrective measures.

PRESENT POLICY

The administration, upon taking office 17 months ago, announced that it would not use its power and influence in the economic sector. Thus, the administration has abdicated its authority in this field. For better or for worse, the powerful economic interests were given a free rein and, as a result, have demanded "whatever the market will bear."

RESULT OF ECONOMIC POLICY

This lack of policy has devastated our economy. By permitting the big banks to charge "what the market will bear," the

administration has presided over the highest interest rates in 100 years. Prime commercial rates—the rates for only the best customers—which were 6 percent in December 1969, are now 8.30 percent.

A 1-percent increase in the interest rate on a 30-year mortgage raises the repayments of principal and interest by 12 percent. On this basis, mortgage interest rate increases over the past 17 months have already raised the cost of housing by nearly 25 percent.

This, in turn, means that the prospective home buyer can no longer buy a home. Thus, the home construction industry cannot afford to build homes for those with a moderate income.

As a result, new housing starts have fallen to 1.1 million units. This is particularly devastating when we realize that we must construct 2.6 million units a year in order to adequately house our population.

A second consequence of the high interest-tight money policy is unemployment. Because money is tight, business cannot expand, and in many instances, must cut back production. The result is less work for those fortunate enough to have a job or no work for the less fortunate. Unemployment, down to 3.4 percent in December 1969, has risen to 5 percent and shows indications of rising even further. In other words, nearly a million Americans have lost their jobs since the present administration took office.

If the unemployment rate continues to increase at its present rate, unemployment by December 1970 will be nearing 7½ percent.

A third consequence of this misguided policy is the rise in the cost of living. The consumer price index shows that inflation is still on the rise. The goods and services that we would purchase for a dollar in 1957-59 are now selling for \$1.34. There has been a 13-cent increase since 1968. When we equate this to food, rent, and clothing, we realize that a man must have received almost an 11-percent increase in pay since 1968 simply to stay even.

CORRECTIVE MEASURES

There is little doubt that this policy of high interest rates, unemployment, and tight money must be revised. The evidence indicates that inflation has not slowed—it has, as a matter of fact, increased.

First, the administration must roll back interest rates. Congress has given the President the tools to control credit. Through Public Law 91-151, the President could require the allocation of credit into areas where it is needed the most and restrict it in areas where there are inflationary trends. Thus far, the President has not used this authority.

Second, the administration should announce its intention to stabilize wages, prices, and other segments of our economy.

Third, the administration should make a greater effort to cut Federal spending in wasteful, unnecessary areas. We must use our funds in productive areas that improve the quality of life for all our citizens.

Finally, we must become more people-oriented and less program-oriented. We must be more concerned with the actual effect a policy may have on the personal situation of an individual, and we should encourage the administration to be more concerned with the programs which consider the housewife, the small businessman, the prospective homebuyer, those on a fixed income, and the moderate- and middle-income worker.

BRIDGES WE ARE BUILDING

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the junior achievement program is one that is to be commended for giving valuable experience to our young people. In Houston, before a banquet of the Junior Achievement of Southeast Texas, Mr. B. F. Biaggini recently spoke on "Bridges We're Building." It contains information I think is noteworthy, and I, therefore, include the text of Mr. Biaggini's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BRIDGES WE'RE BUILDING

Standing before this fine, mixed audience of young and "not quite as young" people and hoping to say something of meaning to two age groups which seem to be speaking different languages at times these days, I feel that I must begin by confessing that I don't know how big a "generation gap" is.

I know the measurement of many things—a yard, a mile, a ton, or even a light year. But the length and breadth of this gap between our generations about which we hear so much today is something that mystifies and bewilders me.

There are and *should be* differences between age and youth. But between the two there should be a *bridge*, not a chasm—a bridge we all have crossed or must cross as part of the natural scheme of things. Certainly the length of the bridge is something that is different for each one of us, but we all have a vital interest in seeing that the bridge is as short, as broad and as sturdy as it is possible for our minds to make it.

I hope this generation gap is not really as wide as some say. How *very much* I hope it, you young people will know for yourselves in just a few years when you hold your own helpless baby in your arms. You will think about how completely this precious little life is dependent upon your care. And then you will ask yourself a question filled with a bittersweet sadness: When he's 15, will I still be able to communicate with this child I love so dearly today?

Since we all start out this way, how can we ever really become strangers who don't even talk to one another?

Let's look at this need to communicate from the standpoint of time. Within the young lifetime of every Junior Achiever here tonight we have seen the first satellites orbit the earth and witnessed the first walk of man on the moon. Within the lifetimes of those of us who sponsor the Junior Achievement program we have seen the development of such wonders as controlled atomic power, television, the jet airplane, the diesel electric locomotive, computers that record practically all of our activities and aid in our decision-making, and—more important—social and material progress on a scale never before known.

We have produced all of this by developing—and being willing to live in—a society that is organized to reward the productive efforts of the individual and to protect the rights of all who believe in and wish to enjoy the opportunities that are available to the individual in that kind of society. In this effort, the United States of America has led the way. It is true, of course, that some parts of the world are more developed than others. But we have demonstrated the principle, and we must not lose sight of it.

It is extremely important that a system such as ours—one which produces the benefits for its people that ours does—should develop from within and grow from within. And it is in that context that we must view this program that we all know so well as Junior Achievement. All of our efforts—our accomplishments for the future—depend on our having a "fountain of youth" from which we can draw the educated, imaginative, resourceful and well-motivated leaders of the future.

Mr. Robinson has told you of my own interest in Junior Achievement, and he himself has been a JA volunteer for 10 years and presently serves as one of your directors. Many others at Southern Pacific also share in this interest. Vice President D. K. McNear is a former vice president, former president and now a director of Junior Achievement of San Francisco. In Houston, we have had approximately 140 of our officers and employees active as advisers in the past 20 years, with about the same number also active in fund drives and other behind-the-scenes activities which enable JA to carry on.

In the 1969-70 Junior Achievement year, Southern Pacific has been sponsoring 32 JA companies in 21 cities from Portland, Oregon to Houston. One of the youngsters in our Phoenix, Arizona JA company, Miss Sharon Jo Patterson, was elected National Junior Achievement president at the annual convention at Indiana University last August 21. Sharon is the first young lady, the first black, the first Arizonan, and the first Southern Pacific-sponsored candidate to win this honor, and we hope she is but the forerunner of other SP-sponsored young people who also will win it.

Because of our interest in Junior Achievement, then, and because I saw an excellent opportunity to meet and talk with some of the finest youth of Houston, I was delighted to accept this Future Unlimited speaking engagement, even if I am a bit unsure about the generation gap. I felt it also would be an opportune time to review with middle management—represented by many of your advisers—and with management—represented by their employers—some thoughts generated by feedback from young people, including those in Junior Achievement. It would be, I hoped, an opportunity to help shrink this mysterious generation gap between us.

When you young people enrolled in Junior Achievement you were promised that if you became totally involved in the program you would achieve satisfaction and enjoyment, coupled with personal growth and a sense of accomplishment. The fact that 175 companies out of 178 ended the year successfully, and that 85% of the enrollees stayed with the program, indicates the promises were kept.

You learned many things this JA year—especially that you must have a reasonable approach, a sincere attitude and a flexibility of mind if you are going to have a decisive influence in affairs which affect you and your company. You also learned to go along with the majority, once a decision was made.

When you came into the program you asked for and expected certain freedoms within which to operate, certain safeguards and guidelines within which to grow. In effect, your Junior Achievement company became a *miniature business in operation*. Then, whether it was popular or not, you *did* con-

form to a set of rules and, as evidenced by your presence here tonight, proved to yourself that required conformity need not be deadly boring or destructive of your initiative. You learned that rules and regulations are helpful—not necessarily restrictive—and that people can only function in groups if they have mutual respect for one another's rights.

You may recall that on February 16, 1970 students at Sam Houston Senior High School (some of whom may be here tonight) staged a protest march aimed at the Houston School Board's crossover integration policies. Principal Kenneth L. Wilbanks allowed the demonstrators about 30 minutes, and then he wisely told them: "You have made your point. Now I suggest that you get on with your business." Equally wise, the students did just that.

The fact is, youth *has* made its point, across the nation, and the point has been emphasized with campus disorders, sit-ins, building takeovers and strikes. Now, it is past time to get on with our real jobs; it is past time to follow a better road. It is time to go where the action *really* is, and to see what you can do to get society moving in your direction.

And believe it, you *can* be effective, you *can* change things. But you must use your energies and resources constructively, and in concert with like-minded people.

Planned action for constructive purposes can work wonders; blind opposition is only time-wasting and frustrating.

Last September I was one of the hosts of the International Industrial Conference at San Francisco, an event which drew leading businessmen as delegates from 70 countries. The visionary theme was "Closing the World Income Gap," and it had to do with ways to apply business know-how to improve the lot of people everywhere.

Among the conference participants was Mr. Amirali Fency, one of the foremost industrialists of Pakistan and also a leader of the Islamics, whose 15 million members follow the spiritual leadership of the Aga Khan. In this second role Mr. Fency has helped to build schools, clinics and hospitals throughout his country.

One afternoon during the conference Mr. Fency was walking down the street when his path was blocked by a young demonstrator—a girl I'd hardly describe as having much regard for good grooming—who demanded of him in a taunting tone: "Well, what have you and your friends accomplished today?" Mr. Fency simply smiled and said, "Young lady, I suspect we have accomplished more today than you and your friends will accomplish in a lifetime, if you continue on your present course."

His words of wisdom could well be applied to you young people in a different, and reverse, sense—because you *will* accomplish a great deal in your lives if you continue in your present course.

But you will need a platform from which to speak, a base from which to operate. You will need finances and organizational skill to motivate people to join your team. And that is why, among many other reasons, you will eventually *become* the so-called "Establishment."

When you do come into everyday contact with this structured, ordered world which some call the Establishment, you are going to find many of the same problems and opportunities you found in Junior Achievement—except that they will be *magnified*. And as you apply yourself in business or professional life you will find the same rewards Junior Achievement brought you—except *they too* will be magnified.

Eventually, you will find that you do have a role in problem solving and you will be called on for recommendations about what part your organization will play in such di-

verse areas as pollution control, plant site beautification, equal employment opportunities, educational support and community welfare programs. These subjects may seem far removed from profit and loss considerations, but they account for more and more planning and thinking time on the management level of business today.

Eventually you will have to decide what part of your revenues you will want to earmark for development and research. Too little, and you may not attract people as inquisitive and eager as you are. Too much, and you may cause other departmental budgets to suffer, or the business even to fail.

You will have to experiment with various pre-employment and advancement testing procedures, and guard against management by seniority alone, which can sometimes become management by mediocrity.

You will have to face severe and unrealistic government restrictions—some of them artificially imposed to protect other businesses which might otherwise face extinction either because of poor management or lack of patronage.

You will have to explain and defend any profits you may make against those whose lack of understanding causes them to believe that profits are evil, and that all business ventures should be owned and operated by the state.

You will have to initiate job performance evaluation systems and relate promotions and salaries to accomplishments, not positions.

You will have to protect your employees and stockholders against cyclical recessions by diversifying activities so that layoffs and shutdowns will be minimized.

You will have to be concerned with turnover at all levels of your organization, and you will have to determine what your responsibilities and obligations are in personnel retention.

You will have to raise your corporate voice occasionally so that those who make the law and those who enforce it will respect your rights, will allow an atmosphere in which you can live and grow, and will protect you, your employees and your plant from irresponsible factions.

You will have to do these things so that you can become successful enough to be able to utilize some of your time to help solve the problems of our society. And, believe it or not, if you do these things well you will find that there will be time available to devote to civic betterment and to family, sports, hobbies and cultural pursuits.

Only 40 years ago, when I was a youngster, it was a big thing to spend a Saturday afternoon at an amusement park or a weekend at the seashore. We would talk about that experience from September to the following June. But just think about the changes! Last summer our Southern Pacific Club at San Francisco chartered two large airplanes to fly members to Europe for three-week vacations. This year club flights will be going to Europe again, to Hawaii and to other distant places, and most of those making these wonderful trips are rank-and-file employees. Technology has reduced the time one must work to have the good life, and it has vastly expanded our opportunities for many extra pleasures of our choice—hobbies, travel, education, sports and recreation.

For the past 32 weeks your JA advisers have been telling you some things about yourselves, about the business world, about their place in it, and about the place you one day can occupy. Many of the things they mentioned, I am sure, have become more meaningful to you as your Junior Achievement year moved along.

When they said you must be dependable in work habits, you recall the nights when key personnel in your company failed to show up, making it impossible either to get out

and sell your product or to manufacture enough for the sales force to sell.

When they said you will need marketable skills, you recall the Achievers who appeared to have two left hands, who tried and tried but could never hammer a nail straight or learn to use a power tool. Perhaps you came to realize that the advisers were right when they said that there is a need for education and training of individuals in basic skills, and for the continual upgrading of those skills, and for care in placing people where they can do the best jobs.

As you reminisce about Junior Achievement some day, you will appreciate the sacrifice in time and energy your advisers made these past 32 weeks, and you will understand that such extra work is an obligation and an extension of training that adults cheerfully accept. This is *their* way of changing society for the better, you see, and this can one day be *your* way of doing the same.

In your 32 weeks with JA you now have been exposed to the *need for profit* and, hopefully, you have come to the conclusion that business careers are as honorable, as challenging and as important as careers in non-profit endeavors, and that they require as much preparation, dedication and commitment as many other worthy careers.

As you have looked at your beautiful new Brookhollow building—one of the most modern JA plants in the nation—I hope it has occurred to you that successful businessmen and successful businesses—out of profits, remember—frequently provide the money and expertise that make community betterment projects possible. When millions must be raised for a United Fund, a hospital, a Junior Achievement program or any worthwhile community effort, it is the business community, large or small, that is asked to lead in making the financial contribution. Usually it is the businessman, big or small, who makes up and heads the committee that goes from door-to-door and office-to-office to raise the money.

Working with visionaries and dreamers, the hardheaded businessman furnishes the material goods and the guidance upon which we are steadily building a better society. His motives and practices are frequently condemned by the uninformed or the misinformed, but none of the critics has brought us a better way to correct the injustices or solve the problems which everyone finds so easy to identify.

Young friends, at least give the Americans of my generation—your fathers and mothers—credit for getting some results. Look around you at the good people in this room who are past 50 and consider some of the things they have done:

They have given you a far healthier world and practically wiped out dreaded epidemics in a score of diseases. They have increased life expectancy about 50% in five decades. They have cut the work week almost a third while more than doubling per capita production. They have lived through modern history's greatest depression and hardest wars, and survived cold and hunger to see that you had good food, warm homes and the greatest educational opportunities ever known.

They have tried to give *you* the best—and you show it, by being the tallest, healthiest, brightest generation ever to grace this land. Because they were materialistic you will work less to earn your own necessities, learn more in less time, enjoy more leisure, and have a wider choice of how you may contribute to society. These are the same people who have *started* the fight against numerous social problems—even if they'll not be allowed the years to finish it. And yes, they also hold the dubious distinction—which I am sure you will inherit—of paying more taxes than any Americans in history!

I often wonder where and how this generation of mine has failed in the face of its multitude of successes and achievements. I believe its greatest shortcoming has been its inability to communicate simply and in understandable terms its great concern for the very problems that are so much in the news today with youth and the entire world. It might surprise and delight many young people to discover that lots of us "old folks" are idealists too.

Practically every businessman that I know has given unselfishly of his time and talent in working on social, cultural and environmental problems. But because they haven't advertised, organized, protested or picketed, their constructive activities have been shoved into the background by a new breed of activities. Unfortunately these hard-working businessmen haven't even really communicated to their own families the truly exciting details of what they are doing and how they are motivated by a sincere concern for the world in which we all live. Could it be that in this failure to share such information—they don't think of their jobs as a drag at all but are just plain weary at 6 p.m. and need a change of pace in order to renew their zest for tomorrow's challenges at work? I think so.

Your own JA advisers are probably a case in point. You know them as sincere, hard-working individuals with your best interests foremost in their minds. But what about their own families? I wonder how many wives and sons and daughters have really been made to understand the importance of what these good men are doing and why—and how many regard JA meeting night as just a night when Daddy's away from home.

Yes, my generation has had failures—many of them. But it is turning over to you young people a world that tolerates failures, and that gives you the means to correct them. If your generation can make as much progress as mine has, you should be able to solve a great many of the earth's remaining ills.

For 32 weeks your advisers have been on a team with your parents, teachers and clergy, trying to work with you toward solutions to some of your problems, trying to answer some of your questions, and trying to broaden the base of mutual understanding. You have discussed and perhaps sometimes disagreed on many subjects. But hopefully you have been building those necessary bridges of understanding, through communications that will remain open to benefit you, your adviser, Junior Achievement and the community at large.

We have been hearing you these past 32 weeks, in Houston and throughout the land, hoping to be able to make a useful appraisal of what you are saying. We have added your thoughts and suggestions to our plans for the future, and we do accept the challenge youth appears to have laid down to us. You have been vocal and you have made some excellent points, and I promise you that the "Establishment" is listening.

You have told us that you want stability, peace and understanding among peoples and nations, so that you can inherit a proper climate for what you want to do to make this world a better place.

You have told us that you want a business-community-government union that respects the autonomy of each segment, without patronage or coercion.

You have told us that you want the opportunity to innovate and experiment, and a chance to grow as individuals.

You have asked us to give further consideration to social consciousness in our business planning so that we can all work to a solution of ecological and environmental problems, integration, educational reform, conservation and beautification.

You have asked for the right to advancement geared to your capabilities, and you

have asked for the setting of realistic goals and objectives.

You have asked us to treat you as human beings, on an individual basis, and not as a set of statistics all painted with one brush.

If, as I have said, we had been able to communicate clearly with each other, you would realize that these are not new thoughts, but rather are views rather widely held in the over-30 group.

My generation does not seek to suppress honest dissent, nor is it frightened of change. It has lived through a lot of both. What it is worried about is the communications gap that persists in some areas and the apparent inability of too many youngsters and adults to bridge it with patience and grace and tolerance.

Houston's Junior Achievement is happy evidence that the bridge can be built—for we have shown these past 32 weeks that we can talk to each other, both ways, and find answers that mean something.

We are all in this world together, good friends. We are going to have to learn to make our decisions in terms of their impacts in a world so crowded that we can hardly turn around without digging our elbows into our neighbors' ribs. We are in a world where we must learn to breathe each other's air, drink each other's water and eat each other's food. We have been placed in each other's close company for a while, and we'd do well to try to enjoy the company. We can, if we listen to each other, learn from each other, and pledge each other mutual trust—and, having done that, join each other in building a brave and wonderful new world.

THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent article which appeared in *The Wall Street Journal* of Tuesday, June 2, 1970, with reference to the pending Cooper-Church amendment. This article is a model of careful reasoning and cuts through some of the sophistries that surround this issue. Certainly it reflects the point of view of many of us who are in the Congress, especially the need for congressional-executive consultation in the handling of our foreign policy commitments:

THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

As the Senate debates the Cooper-Church amendment to cut off funds for certain types of military operations in Cambodia, our biggest headache is trying to figure out what its words mean. Its passage would do more harm than good unless something is done to clarify what it says, first, about the President's power to strike into Cambodia in protection of American troops already in the field, and second, about policies intended to bolster the non-Communist government in Cambodia.

On its face the amendment seems to say that despite the President's powers as Commander in Chief he cannot undertake military operations in Cambodia even if enemy forces there are attacking or about to attack American troops already in South Vietnam. Either the amendment means this or it means nothing at all with regard to this question; its sponsors seem confused as to which is the case. Witness Senator Church on the Senate floor:

"We do not raise into question here the power the President has as Commander in Chief. He derives that authority from the Constitution itself. We could not deny him his powers under the Constitution if we tried. Nothing in our amendment would interfere with his right to protect American troops in the field or to provide for their immediate needs."

If the amendment does fully preserve the President's right to protect American troops, then it does not change his right to act within Cambodia if his purpose is to protect American troops, as it is in the current operations. If the amendment denies him the right to act in Cambodia regardless of his purpose, then it interferes with his right to protect American troops in ways the Commander in Chief deems necessary. The amendment's sponsors cannot have it both ways.

Both the Constitution and common sense dictate that Congress cannot act as Commander in Chief of troops actually in the field, as it would be doing when it draws lines of military maps in a theater long since drawn into the war by the enemy. It does not wish to say it's different because international boundaries are involved when the enemy constantly violates these boundaries and when the nation involved does not object. Nor does it wish to say Congress is only formalizing limits the President himself has established, since limits are one thing when drawn by the Commander in Chief and another thing when etched into law.

At the amendment's second level, we find another set of considerations. We think it entirely appropriate that Congress concern itself with the broad question of American policy toward the Cambodian government, and in fact we think the Administration should seek to involve Congress here. But once again we are left unsure what policy the Cooper-Church amendment seeks to promote. There is quite a difference between a policy of "no American troops" and a policy of "let the place sink."

The general thrust—and the ostensible defense—of the amendments is to implement a policy of no American troops. It has a sleeper section, however, that could undercut any effort whatever to aid Cambodia in its self-defense. This section prohibits U.S. participation in any agreement to provide military instruction in Cambodia. In other words, the U.S. could not provide technical or financial assistance if the South Vietnamese, Indonesians, Thais, Koreans or others undertook to help Cambodia train its army.

It's difficult to conceive a more wrong-headed provision. If we want to reduce our presence in Asia, regional cooperation is what we should try to promote, not inhibit. Also, the section makes hash of the sponsors' arguments that they only want to help the President follow the policy he has already set, for nothing could be more contradictory to the Nixon doctrine.

Despite all this, the Cooper-Church amendment is directed at a concern with which we sympathize—that Congress be more involved in foreign policy. What is needed is the type of Congressional-Executive consultation that helped prevent an Indochina expedition in support of the French during the Eisenhower years. But it is not a matter of writing a law but of building an ongoing process; a specific piece of legislation is important only to the extent it helps build the basis for a continuing process. As it now stands, casting an ambiguous shadow both on the President's powers as Commander in Chief and on the Nixon doctrine of U.S. assistance for self-help, the Cooper-Church amendment will not build but undermine the process.

Yet it could conceivably be turned into something else if the Senate and the Ad-

ministration can work together to clarify what it says about the Commander in Chief's powers and to remove the sleeper section. In the process of working out those problems, perhaps the two branches could make a small start toward the trust, understanding and cooperation necessary to truly meaningful consultation on future policy.

OVERGUILT: A PROBLEM FOR AMERICANS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Post printed an abbreviated version of the article entitled "Overguilt: A Problem for Americans," by June Rossbach Bingham. The article originally appeared in the April 1970 Vassar Alumnae magazine.

Mrs. Bingham, the author of several biographies and a contributor to the New York Times Magazine and McCall's, is, as many of you may know, the wife of our distinguished colleague from the 23d District of New York.

During the recent Anglo-American Conference on Africa, Mrs. Whalen and I had the opportunity to become acquainted with this accomplished writer and delightful woman. The discussions we had with her on the generation gap were as probing and perceptive as her article. She herself possesses the "ineffable grace of humor," one of the attributes she suggests be used to silt up the generation gap.

Mr. Speaker, as I believe Mrs. Bingham's very timely article will be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the Record, I insert it at this point:

OVERGUILT: A PROBLEM FOR AMERICANS

(By June Rossbach Bingham)

Like Spanish moss, guilt is growing down over the faces of Americans. Saplings are being bowed, mature trees are stifling, and some proud old ones have collapsed.

Overguilt, like overkill, is counterproductive. It may lead to paralysis or a tragic waste of resources. While "a little learning is a dangerous thing," with the corollary that much learning is good, the reverse applies to guilt: a little is good, but too much may be dangerous. Maddened by its good, the overguilty person, like the rogue elephant, may charge about, bashing his head into immovable objects or trampling other people under foot. Neither he nor his victim may recognize the cause of his embattlement. But the existence of overguilt may be surmised when someone consistently puts his worst foot forward. As C. P. Snow writes in his latest novel:

"Guilty relationships, the more so if the guilt was not conscious, had a built-in tendency to lead to further guilt. One had done something which one couldn't thrust away or live with peacefully or reconcile with one's nature: with many people . . . there grew a violent impulse to do something which one could face even less. Guilty relationships pushed both partners further to the extreme. All guilt had a tendency towards escalation . . . George knew that those who accused him or mourned over him were right: well, to hell with them, he'd give them twice as much to be right about."

What Freud called "free-floating anxiety"

seems nowadays to have a counterpart in "free-floating guilt." This appears both in collective and personal form, both in the public domain and the secret recesses of the insomniac heart, both in common to Americans and as varied between the generations. Causes for guilt, moreover, seem to be proliferating during the very period when the traditional guilt-reducers have been dwindling in power. The possibility of divine forgiveness is not available to those convinced that "God is dead." For many there is a vacuum not only where God, but also the devil used to be. In place of the devil, therefore, some people find no one to blame but themselves or others when things go wrong. Sometimes this insistence on laying all blame on human shoulders, a form perhaps of hubris, leads to panic. Says Michael Thomas in *Look*, April 15, 1969: "I was sneaking around New York like a . . . guerrilla, in constant fear of being arrested. . . . Somewhere alone the line, I'd forgotten that I'd not done anything wrong. I'm going to court tomorrow. . . . I'm sure they're going to find me guilty . . . because I feel guilty. It's just a little Local Paranoia, but it grows and grows."

In addition to the loss of guilt-reducers there may be loss of opportunity to make amends. Especially is this true when the aggrieved party has developed a vested interest in his role as The Oppressed, perhaps as an escape from his overguilt. Some militant black leaders, for example, make it impossible for a sympathetic white to join in their overdue battle for social justice; some disenfranchised young people, white and black, refuse to allow for the possibility that the middle class—or their parents as its symbol or representative—could do anything right. On the other side of the fence, some parents and academics refuse to entertain the uncomfortable hypothesis that dissident students, as "consumers" of modern upbringing and education, could be correct in their negative, complacency-blasting assessments. Says a college dean, more elastic than many of his colleagues: "We keep talking about when we were their age, forgetting that we never were their age."

Some of the young have coupled their loathing for the ancient barriers between white and black, male and female, rich and poor, between nations and between religions, with the erection of an equally bristling barrier between the generations. There is, they insist, a radical discontinuity between those above and below the Great Divide (of thirty). So seductive has this concept of discontinuity become that, in the below-thirty group, a "generation" is no longer defined in biological terms of two to three decades, but in psychological terms of two to three years. Among some newly emerging adolescents, the word is "Don't trust anyone over seventeen." A woman with a twenty-three-year-old son in the police force and a twenty-one-year-old recently suspended from college, refers to "my son, the cop," and "my son, the cop-out."

These many young "generations" tend to be more tolerant of each other than of an elder, even when there is substantive disagreement among them. Statistically few, but highly publicized, are the extremists, whether of far left or far right, together with the far back, the far out, and those males from 11 up to 24 who comprise 75 per cent of the persons arrested for serious crimes. The vast majority, far less publicized, comprise the demi-rebels, or the demi-squares, or the uneasy commuters between these two positions. Says John Hersey, a master of one of Yale's residential colleges, "Students . . . are the most open, most threatened, most serious, most generous people I [have] ever known."

Why do so many feel so threatened? True, the post-nuclear world offers unprecedented dangers. As one young man said bitterly, "We

recognize that our fate is in the hands of someone we don't even know." Yet this world also offers unprecedented opportunities. Ironically, it is sometimes the opportunities rather than the dangers that cause the worst anxiety. For opportunity entails freedom of choice, and with choice comes responsibility, admitted or not, and with responsibility may come guilt, admitted or not.

Some young people suffer the guilt of not living up to the inflated standards of an upwardly mobile society; others suffer the guilt of not being able to find sufficiently "relevant" standards to live up to. With the ancient philosophies and theologies thrown open to question, there is no longer a generally recognized structure into which a person can fit himself and relax. Today he is not even sure when he is right. Indeed, whatever he does, he finds some people he admires disapproving of it. Small wonder that many young people are fearful of making a commitment, or having made one, keep worrying at it. The state of anomie, or normlessness, of doing your own thing, turns out, in many instances, to be less fun than advertised. When a compass has no "North," its owner may wander in circles, while his loved ones cannot chart their course by him. When "the sky's the limit," one of many old adages that cry out for redefinition, an individual may not know either how much to trust others or himself. To be weightless is not a comfortable alternative to being overloaded.

"In today's existential vacuum," says Viktor Frankl, "no instinct tells man what he has to do, and no tradition tells him what he ought to do; soon he will not know what he wants to do."

Many of the young respond to this "existential vacuum" with quiet desperation or loud complaint; others turn to radical passivity or activism. A few become loners, the modern equivalent of the Flying Dutchman, refusing to give themselves to a person or to society, while others escape into intimacy with one partner or a small group whose judgment is sufficiently reassuring for them to "feel good about" themselves. But no matter what the arrangement, or lack of arrangement, it is subject to change without notice.

In characterizing the impermanence of many young Americans—and their counterparts in other developed countries—psychiatrist Robert J. Lifton refers to the legendary old man of the sea who changed his form whenever threatened. In *Partisan Review*, Lifton says of "protean man":

"Rather than being free of guilt, his guilt merely takes on a different form. . . . He suffers considerably from it, but often without awareness of what is causing his suffering. For his is a form of hidden guilt: a vague but persistent kind of self-condemnation related to an awareness that he has no outlet for his loyalties and no symbolic structure for his achievements. This is the guilt of social breakdown . . . experienced by whole nations and people, both the privileged and the abused."

In this period of "social breakdown" or "existential vacuum" the elders have their own forms of overguilt. Having grown up in a time when Puritanism had been reinforced by Victorianism, they find themselves today in a tide-rip of values. They may, for example, be condemned by the young for uptightness about the very habits of self-control, dutifulness, and ability to plan from which their elders had criticized the slightest lapse. The sacrifices they had made for their children may now be rejected rather than appreciated and the parental role of selflessness devaluated to that of a patsy. Accustomed to feeling guilty for their faults, they may now feel guilty for their virtues. And their guilt may be intensified when a member of what Jack Newfield characterizes as the "me, now,

and why not" generation accuses them of "hypocrisy."

Two groups of these elders are relatively fortunate. One group has reached the open plateau where far-sighted old eyes can range over wide vistas; where the knapsack of responsibility can gratefully be laid down; and where the person may become what nature appears to intend and which many Oriental societies honor, namely, the observer rather than participant. For better or worse their choices have been made and their periods of testing survived. They have made their bed, but sometimes their grandchild will not let them lie in it in peace. Instead he blames them personally for the institutional hypocrisies to which his generation has made people more sensitive than formerly. "You complain of modern violence," said a youth to his liberal, kindly grandparents, "but the way you serve large meals when babies are starving strikes me as violence."

The second relatively fortunate group is middle-aged, with time enough still to try out some of the more "natural" attitudes promulgated by the young, together with experience enough to choose among them. Such people appreciate youthful experimentation, believing there would be small progress without it. They also recognize that the post-nuclear world stands in parous need of new ways of relating, in the national as well as the personal sphere. Somehow they have come to terms with their own mistakes, either through the grace of God's or man's forgiveness, or through the opportunity to make restitution, or through the aid of friends or "helping" professionals. Or they may be lucky enough to have found the kind of work that for them, as for Kahlil Gibran's Prophet, is "love made visible." Yet their peace too may be shattered when the young make them lose their temper or their appetite by what Kenneth Keniston calls the "metaphysical violence that refuses the humanity of one's opponent." As he writes in *The Young Radicals*:

"During a time when values change with each generation, the values most deeply embedded in parents and expressed in their behavior in times of crisis are often very different from the more 'modern' principles, ideals, and values that parents profess. . . . Filial perception of the discrepancy . . . may help explain the very widespread sensitivity amongst contemporary youth to the 'hypocrisy' of the previous generation."

Indeed some confrontations by the young, whether on campus or in the living room, seem designed to bring on the very "times of crisis" that test the authenticity of the elders' beliefs. The elder who is thus forced to shift gears from the rational to the irrational may find his "gut-reaction" fitting poorly into his cherished picture of himself as a mature (cool) and tolerant person.

Two groups of less fortunate elders react to such times of crisis in opposite ways. One group might be called the "cubes"—square any way you slice them. From atop their self-built pedestals they deliver absolutist moral judgments that "turn off" not merely the young but many of their contemporaries as well. How much—if any—unconscious jealousy of the young underlies their intransigence is anybody's guess. In all events their refusal to reconsider their own basic tenets may serve, as does the youthful extremism, to widen the generation gap.

The second group are those who collapse in the face of the young challenger. Psychologically they stand, head down, patiently accepting every load of blame, personal and collective regardless of any choice they had in the matter or any statute of limitations. They may feel not just regret—or justified anger—but self-flagellating remorse when reminded of the heinous acts by slave owners half a century before their own ancestors had set foot on this continent. And they rarely correct even the most exaggerated or biased accusation against them by the challenger.

"We must have done something wrong," is workable as a hypothesis, especially if it leads to amends or doing better next time. But it is not workable as a way of life. Over-guilt for these people may appear in the form of a blanket placativeness; the varsity letter they sport figuratively on their sweater may be "M" for "Martyr."

Their collapse, moreover, may take physical as well as psychological form. There may be a stoppage of the heart or of the ability to sleep; they may develop a depression or one of the many psychosomatic ailments. These people may be lost in what Dante called the "dark wood, midway in the journey of life," when reverse adolescence can cause an agonizing identity crisis in both sexes. Some parents or academics feel as if suddenly set down upon sand, not the hardpacked variety, but the soft blowing stuff of the desert, constantly shifting, difficult to keep their balance—or their humor—in. Unless they can find a buried pylon on which to place their feet, they sink, as in quicksand, despite a belated or frantic shoveling by their confidant.

A college junior, intelligent, short-haired, and at times short-tempered, announced to his parents one vacation that he had decided never to marry.

They, knowing his fondness for young ladies, were astounded.

"After seeing your marriage," he said, "I never want one of my own."

Well, one reaction to that remark might have been, "Lots of luck. Anyone as pompous and cruel as you, my boy, deserves to live alone."

Another reaction might have been the stomach-drop of fear that he is on drugs. For some people react, even long after a sizable intake of psychedelics, by demonstrating a loftiness of manner that is similar to pomposity, or a loss of empathy with non-drug-takers that is similar to cruelty. Says a recent Yale study:

"Such people seem to have a high opinion of their own profundity, a feeling that they are more creative and productive than any objective measure indicates; a tendency to feel dissociated and detached, as if they were above and beyond the normal world of social reality; a relatively high degree of interpersonal insensitivity toward those who do not share all their assumptions, and an impulsivity that might be seen as intolerance of any limits, questions or skepticism."

The reaction of the young man's parents, however, was instant guilt. He probably never noticed, but his barb remained festering in their consciences, exacerbating the insecurity that had been part of their root-problem, and degenerating into guilt's deformed offspring, self-hatred.

Since the young man does not take drugs, what could he have been thinking? That his parents had deliberately had a stormy marriage? That it does not take more effort to keep a marginal marriage going than a blissful one blissful? Has he never played tennis while his partner was double-faulting, and found it worse than useless to make the partner feel so guilty that tension botches his forehand as well? Or was the young man unthinkingly following the mores of his peer group, namely, in the cause of their high ideal of "openness" and honesty, to kick sleeping dogs awake?

And why did the two old dogs, in self-defense, not growl or nip? Why did they not point out that the person who insists on "sharing" some thought that he knows will be shattering to his listeners may not be "sharing" at all? Instead, he may be using his "openness and honesty" as a form of bludgeoning—or of proselytizing—not because he is secure, but precisely because he is insecure. (The young man, as he reported later with chagrin, had been having girl-trouble.)

Why should the young, today, so often feel insecure? In part, perhaps, because their age-group is the first to have been confronted since early childhood with a bedlam of decisions that in ancient Greece were made by Fate, that in the Bible were made by God, that in the days of the settlers were made by Providence, and that in most other parts of the world are still made, at least partially, by the person's family or tribe, his economic or social niche—in short, by something other than his conscious mind. "In Africa and most of Southwest Asia," says Dr. Nathan S. Kline, "when something goes wrong, the individual will share his depression, or his confused perceptions, with other members of the group. These people simply don't have the Westerner's sense of individual responsibility. Moreover, these people are also able to share their troubles with their ancestors, whom they believe are still very much present as spirits. Finally, they have a belief in white magic. This enables them to believe that things can change almost overnight. . . . They never feel boxed in, that there is no way out as the . . . anxious person often feels in the West."

Americans under thirty feel anxious for another reason. They were the first to be brought up according to the advice of the then-new profession of child-development "experts" whose ideas were popularized only after World War II. When the conscientious parent, at their behest, was sufficiently understanding and articulate for his children to become more aware of their own dependent, aggressive, and sexual drives than the parent ever was, he may unwittingly have handed them a key to Pandora's box.

For when today's elders were young, many thoughts literally did not cross their minds. These are often the thoughts that do cross the mind of today's young person. They also cross the television screen upon which his eyes have been focused since before the age of memory. Once an emotion has entered a person's consciousness, he may be forced to make a decision about it. Should he let it cross his lips? Should he act on it? Often before he has decided what to do, another uninvited emotion appears. He is bedeviled by a multiplicity of choice. Often after he has made a decision, he is plagued by doubts. Lot's wife is not the only character who turned to salt after looking backward once too often.

While the young person wrenches about in confusion, turning for reassurance perhaps to astrology, or to I Ching, or to his age-group, he sees the authority—figures of his world acting as if they knew what they were about. Their seeming certainty, he reasons, must be a hang-up or hypocrisy. Else how could they be going about their business when this "business" of theirs has led to a loathed war abroad and to racial and economic injustices at home that are far more "obscene" than all the four-letter words laid end to end. Enraged by the establishment's apparent willingness to treat some humans as sub-humans, the young person rushes about taking any old bull by the horns. The ensuing struggle may or may not lead to new insights on either side, but it is almost certain to exhaust the aging bull—or cow.

The rage of young Americans toward their own authority-figures was noted by one of the middle-aged who identifies with them. Said Norman Mailer in his Pulitzer Prize winner of 1969:

"A generation of the American young had come along different from five previous generations of the middle class. . . . In their hate for the authority. . . . The authority was the manifest of evil to this generation."

Today even the non-radical young person considers himself more "hip" than his elders ("hip" deriving from "hep," a jazz term meaning "aware"). And he is likely to be correct, in that the many inner choices he has been forced to make have given him new forms of awareness. Awareness, further-

more, like murder, will "out," with the young person feeling compelled at times to report to his elders not merely on what he considers to be their mistakes, but on what he knows they will consider to be his mistakes. Few have the tact to smoke behind the barn any longer; they prefer to swagger into the house, or campus, with butt (or worse) in hand.

A college freshman, for example, doing well in her studies, kept telephoning her parents about the coming weekend's pot-parties. She thus forced them to become co-conspirators in her breaking of the law or to issue an order they could neither enforce nor even check up on.

It would appear that the prime bugaboo for many young people is not the old fear of adult disapproval but the fear of avoiding this disapproval through half-truth or silence, both being seen as forms of hypocrisy. Jousting is no longer on horseback with a young contemporary, but indoors with an elder. These young people have not stopped to distinguish between deceit in the service of self-interest, and half truth in the service of the other person's feelings. Nor are they willing to believe that their favorite virtue, openness, can be a form of aggression, while hypocrisy, their most hated vice, may, like silence, be a form of love.

In time, the young people may discover that there can be a problem, the solution of which is a more difficult problem, and that fooling some of the people some of the time—or even remaining silent while they innocently fool themselves—may be preferable to crippling them. In the meantime, the young continue to be puzzled by the appearance within themselves, after one of the confrontations, of a deep unease. It cannot be guilt, for, are they not pure (i.e., free and open)? The faults, then, must lie with the parents for flaunting their pain, no doubt, in order to manipulate the young. Yet this reasoning too brings no surcease. How ironic, it would be, if despite their unprecedented and valuable awareness, the young were chaining themselves with links of overguilt to the very people from whom they are trying to detach themselves.

The parents, for their most part, may feel a deep relief when their young person is finally detached enough to handle his own life. For they are then freed from some of the overguilt that may also stem from the advice of the child development "professionals." Whereas parenting, for the Victorians, was simple—nothing to it, just don't spare that rod—it is, for the modern parent, a source of chronic anxiety. Let their child, perhaps even when grown, have an accident or illness, a failure in work or relationships with people, and overtly or covertly, the parents will be blamed—or blame themselves. Said the late Drew Pearson, a columnist less sentimental than many of his equally widely-read colleagues:

"All the specialists report that the family plays the most important part in building a child. He can be raised in the slums, in abject poverty, even without much education, and if he has a strong father and mother, he will not only survive but become a constructive citizen."

Left out of such over-simplifications are the many other influential factors such as the grab-bag of the genes, the child's sex and place in the family, the kind of "chemical" reaction he sets up in other people, and his suitability to his historic era. Fortunately, though belatedly, Freud's doctor-daughter, Dr. Anna Freud, together with some of her pediatric colleagues, has come to the rescue of the brow-beaten mother, Jewish and otherwise:

"To put the blame for the child's neurosis on the mother's short-comings . . . is a facile, misleading generalization. I believe we ought to view the mother's influence

against the background of the child's spontaneous developmental attitudes."

The child today develops against a background that includes the bomb and the pill, the "tube" and the computer, and a dimension of change unparalleled in history. Buckminster Fuller encapsules this dimension by comparing Einstein's view of the universe with Newton's:

"Newton said . . . that a body persists in a state of rest except as it is affected by other bodies; normal was 'at rest'; Einstein turned it the other way: 186,000 miles a second is normal; we are living in a world where change is normal."

Normal it may be, but there remain parts of the human psyche that cannot keep up with it. Nor can these slow-to-learn, largely unconscious parts be hurried by conscious effort. Un-American as it may be to admit it, there are areas of living wherein it is no longer true that "where there's a will, there's a way." Effort of will, for example, will neither speed a realignment in the deep unconscious nor slow the rate of change that is placing both generations in their particular form of "the double bind."

This term, coined by psychiatrists Donald Jackson and Gregory Bateson, covers a process, often unconscious, whereby the maximum of guilt is caused with the minimum of effort. It is related to what the logicians call "paradox," to what the theologians call "the ambiguity of the human situation," and to what the layman calls, "damned if you do and damned if you don't." A jocular version is Dan Greenberg's mother who, after giving him two sport shirts, greets his arrival, wearing one of them, with "So, you didn't like the other?"

A medieval version, fortunately rare, was a test for witchcraft. The suspected person was bound and thrown into deep water. If he floated, he was a witch rejecting his baptism; if he sank, he drowned. A Victorian version, more widespread, was the ditty:

"Mother, may I go in for a swim?"

"Yes, my darling daughter,

"Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,

"But don't go near the water."

Some double-binds seem to be written into the human script. When King Oedipus discovered what his, and every man's, ambivalence toward his parents had led him to do, he put out his eyes. Even earlier in infancy than the Oedipal bind, according to Erik Erikson, is the six-month-old's impulsive biting of the breast that feeds him.

Though the existence of the double-bind is not new, the recognition of its implications is. And within this recognition lies one way to reduce overguilt. For when a problem is admitted to be beyond our solution, the responsibility for not having solved it drops from our shoulders. We can continue to try out alternate ways of handling it, but our frustration need not be compounded with inordinate self-blame. Says the Columbia philosopher, Charles Frankel, about our post-modern period:

"[The] greatest ambiguity or tension is between its belief that man has the power to solve his problems and the obvious circumstances that respect for man and tolerance for him require the acceptance of his inability to solve all or even many of his problems. . . . While we must never admit defeat, we are going to have to live with deep disappointments."

Disappointments, yes; overguilt, no! In the interest of silting up the generation gap, we might consider some of the following activities:

To find a bloodless scapegoat, whether a hoary one such as tough luck, or a current one such as the torrents of change, and load upon it rather than upon human shoulders the surplus shame and blame;

To declare the double-bind, like the blow beneath the belt, an unfair practice, and de-

termine neither consciously to use it nor allow its use on oneself. (Some binds can be escaped by saying to their inflictor, "Since I can't fully satisfy you either way, I'll do neither.")

To summon afterward, if not at the time, the ineffable grace of humor. "I will remember," said an older man recently to a troubled youth, "how I used to sit around with my guilt, waiting for my crime to come along."

To draw up a guilt-disarmament-treaty between the generations, a *détente cordiale*. One clause might be for the young to reduce the roughness of their confrontations. "Silence isn't golden," said a newly emancipated person just over thirty, "it is diamonds; it is uranium." The second clause might be for the elders to reduce the extent of their perfectionism (a programming of them perhaps, by their post-Victorian parents). As a former rebel, now happily married, with a child, said about the ancient guilts that, like tarbaby, are still clinging to her:

"When you're a kid and all things seem possible, your parents' expectations may seem tolerable. But when you get older, busier, more defined, limited—it may be too much to have them criticizing towards the same ideal as before."

The third clause might be to reward the overguilt reliever and punish the overguilt loader (a guilt-loader may be halted by loading guilt on him for guilt-loading, much as a forest fire can be halted by lighting a well-placed counter-fire).

Overguilt loaders of both generations can be spotted by their harshness of judgment, the stone in their hand ready for casting at anyone who does not conform to their particular set of values. Overguilt relievers, on the other hand, can be spotted by their lack of need for self-justification and a capacity for endurance that gives time a chance to bring new developments or new perspective on old developments. As General Smuts once said, "There are situations in which time is the only solvent."

By whatever solvent, when overguilt is reduced, a benign rather than vicious cycle is likely to follow, with each generation no longer so defensive that it cannot budge from its fixed position. The elders, precisely because they are older, might be the first to initiate the guilt-reduction process. For with their telescopic lens of age, they can see far enough ahead to picture their young person, unless there has been reconciliation, left at their death with a possibly crippling burden of overguilt, especially when he reaches his middle years. Whoever takes the first step, moreover, may be amazed at the warmth that, all along, has been underlying the crust.

One middle-aged parent paid a visit to her grown son who was living in a far state. She summoned her courage and asked him to forgive her for having got a divorce while he was growing up.

"But Mother," he said gently, "there's nothing to forgive. It wasn't anyone's fault that while I was growing up, so were you."

MILLS-HARSHA BILL WILL SOLVE SHOE AND TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEM

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, today, I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in support of legislation that is vitally important to the people of my

district and, indeed, the entire Nation. This legislation, H.R. 16397, which provides for orderly trade in textile articles and in articles of leather footwear, is urgently needed and long overdue.

As you know, H.R. 16397, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, would regulate imports of textiles and shoes either by law or through international negotiations. This regulation has become increasingly necessary over the years as the American markets have been deluged by imports of these vital commodities. The problem has existed for quite some time, but in recent years it has grown in a dramatic and devastating way. Since 1960, shoe imports have increased by 600 percent. The entire growth of 80 million pairs in the U.S. market in the past 2 years has gone to foreign shoe manufacturers, with imports increasing nearly 30 percent from 1967 to 1968. Similarly, textile imports from all sources rose from 2.9 billion square yards in 1967 to 3.6 billion square yards in 1968. Furthermore, the advances in textile arrangement, entered into by the United States and other nations in 1961, inadequate to prevent the disruption of markets for textile articles in the United States. The effects of increasing imports are already being felt in segments of our economy which can least afford it. The vast majority of shoe manufacturing takes place in small towns, where the factories are the major sources of income and employment. These small and medium-sized manufacturers form the backbone of the industry and, unfortunately, it is these same manufacturers who first feel the damage which has been done by the unrestrained growth of imports.

This is true in my district in Ohio, which is particularly affected by rising shoe imports. It is indeed frightening then to realize that unless some form of control is instituted, foreign manufacturers will probably absorb nearly 50 percent of our American footwear market by 1975. Furthermore, there is every indication that foreign shoe imports could conceivably equal as much as 90 percent of U.S. production in just 5 short years.

In the face of this overwhelming evidence of damage to our markets and to our economy, the Congress must take action. We must protect American workers and the shoe and textile industries from the existing perilous import situation. The legislation which the committee is considering provides an effective and flexible method of dealing with the import problem and I have urged the committee to report it favorably for House action, as soon as possible.

In a nation such as ours where the economy is based on free enterprise, there is also an important need for fair enterprise. We do not seek to close our markets, but it is essential that we make every effort to protect our own economy through fair competition policies. By implementing shoe and textile import quotas in such a manner we can maintain a healthy economic stability at home while encouraging other nations to share in our markets without overrunning them.

I have urged expedition of this all important matter before the Ways and Means Committee, and I am addressing my colleagues today to call their attention to the Mills-Harsha bill so that when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives we will be able to take prompt, favorable action.

CHILD CARE PROGRAMS ENDORSED BY PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the report of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, which was released this week, includes a recommendation for expanded child care services in the United States. Their recommendation reads as follows:

The Administration Should Urge Congress To Adopt the Liberalized Provisions for Child Care Proposed in S. 2986 for Inclusion in the Social Security Act (Section 437 of Title IV). The Administration Should Also Support Authorization of Federal Aid for Child Care for Families Not Covered Under the Family Assistance Plan, With at Least a Modest Appropriation in 1970.

Lack of adequate child care facilities has been found to be a major deterrent to solution or even significant progress in providing greater education opportunities for children, reducing the welfare burden, giving greater dignity and self-respect to mothers on welfare, filling critical manpower needs in shortage occupations and providing real freedom of choice in life style for women.

Every Federal and State study of the status of women has referred to the necessity for expanding child care facilities.

Department of Labor manpower experts cite lack of child care as the most serious single barrier to job training or employment for low-income mothers.

Our national goal should be:

1. A system of well-run child care centers available to all pre-school children. Although priority would be given the needs of low-income working mothers, the facilities should be available to middle income mothers who wish to use them.

2. After-school activities for school-age children at all economic levels who require them.

The National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity estimated this year that 700,000 migrant children need day care. Only 13,000 spaces are available.

The Council found that 1,373,000 economically deprived children could have benefited from participation in full-time Head Start programs. Only 213,000 spaces were funded this year.¹

The Task Force endorses the Administration's plan for increasing facilities for care of pre-school and school age children, with priority for low income and welfare families.

In addition, we recommend that the Administration support legislation to authorize Federal grants for developing child care facilities for families at all income levels, with at least a modest appropriation.

¹ Office of Economic Opportunity, *Continuity and Change in Antipoverty Programs*, Second Report of National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity, 1969.

The funds would be used to construct child care centers, expand existing care programs, renovate facilities, assist States in improving their licensing standards, train professional and sub-professional staff, research, food programs, and a comprehensive study of existing child care programs at Federal, State, and local levels.

The House Republican task force on education and training earlier this spring issued a report endorsing much the same approach to expanding child care development services. Our approach—emphasis on services for the economically disadvantaged while at the same time making services available to all who need them, including the children of working mothers by gearing fees to income levels—was endorsed in legislation introduced by some 40 Republican Members of Congress. The bill, H.R. 15776, also provided for increased emphasis on training professional and paraprofessional personnel for work with young children; research and development of more effective programs; construction of facilities and evaluation of Federal programs for young children.

Presently, the Select Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee is in the process of taking final action on a Comprehensive Child Development Act which coincides with the points recommended by the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. It is our hope that this legislation will be enacted into law during this session of Congress and will stand as the first significant step in providing the children of the Nation—including the children of mothers who work outside the home—with the child care and child development services needed to assure their sound development during the first 5 years of life.

FREEDOM FOR THE BALTIC STATES

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, through the years, I have conceived it to be my duty to join with all my colleagues here, and fellow citizens throughout the country, in urging the Soviet Union to concretely demonstrate the reality of their proclaimed words and good intentions by granting freedom to the Baltic States and all the other small countries that they have illegally occupied and enslaved. I have also been very glad to urge the President of the United States to exert his influence, as this Nation's Chief Executive, upon the United Nations, to call upon the Russian leaders to restore the rights of self-determination to all the people that they now unlawfully hold in subjugation.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is only by persevering in these public expressions and efforts, which we surely owe to the unfortunate people in these dominated countries, that we will be able to generate sufficient world condemna-

tory opinion and pressure to convince Soviet Russia to liberate the persecuted peoples in the Baltic States and the other small countries that Russia still holds under tyrannical rule.

I am, therefore, very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to include, at this point, the statement and resolution copy, recently forwarded to me by Leonard Valiukas, president of the executive committee of the Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States. The material follows:

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA AND ESTONIA

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for 30 years.

The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Balts, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic States. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S.

Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83rd Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. The American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the aforesaid House committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, this committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to this committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration of the U.S. Congress which states that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

Recently the U.S. Congress has made a right step in the right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "PEACEABLE PEOPLE"

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, increasingly of late we find individuals or groups of individuals resorting to violence in expressing their views on controversial issues. Increasingly these extremists preempt the public stage to the exclusion of others. This polarization poses a considerable danger to our constitutional freedoms and to our country. This fact has been observed very eloquently in recent days by the distinguished gentle lady from Maine, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and by Mr. John Gardner and others. A commentary upon their views appeared as the lead editorial on Wednesday, June 10, in the Washington Post. I think this commentary ably sets forth a situation which should receive the attention of all thinking people.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "PEACEABLE PEOPLE"

"One might suppose that as extremists become increasingly inflammatory, moderates would close ranks and oppose them. But just the opposite is occurring. The moderates begin to take sides against one another. . . . Lest this give the impression that moderates are victimized, let it be said at once that most of them have a secret complicity in the activities of the extremist. The moderate conservative does not explicitly approve of police brutality, but something in him is not displeased when the billy club comes down on the head of a long-haired student. The liberal does not endorse violence by the extreme left; but he may take extreme pleasure in such action when it discomfits those in authority."

The observation comes from the text of

an undelivered speech by John Gardner, parts of which were printed on this page a while back. About the same time—on the heels of the Kent State killings—a long and exceedingly wise editorial in the Wall Street Journal made a number of similar points. It turned a shaft of light on the intellectual acrobatics of those who know better but who still manage to condone the brutalities of the violent left, and it was equally unsparing of those—who also know better—who cannot conceal a degree of brutish joy when the violent left meets violent counterattack. Since then we have had, in addition, Sen. Margaret Chase Smith's perceptive and moving appeal to the same persons, based on the same analysis of where the real danger lies in our present social chaos:

"It is time that the great center of our people, those who reject the violence and unreasonableness of both the extreme right and the extreme left, searched their consciences, mustered their moral and physical courage, shed their intimidated silence, and declared their consciences. It is time that with dignity, firmness and friendliness, they reason with, rather than capitulate to, the extremists on both sides—at all levels—and caution that their patience ends at the border of violence and anarchy that threatens our American democracy."

Both Mrs. Smith and the Wall Street Journal warned—accurately, in our opinion—that anarchy on the left will beget repression from the right and that in any ultimate conflict between the two, repression is likely to prevail.

There are several things to be said about all this, and the first, in our view, is that these sensible, anguished voices are speaking truth—and they are speaking it in a disinterested, and therefore most compelling, way. Sen. Smith and Mr. Gardner are Republicans, and the Wall Street Journal is constitutionally conservative in outlook. Yet in none of the warnings concerning the radical students is there even the most faintly perceptible sound of a grinding ax. For these are not contestants in a national street-fight, contributors to our chaos who announce from on high that they see no reason to "lower their voices" or stop "shouting fire" until Jerry Rubin does. They do not view themselves that way. They are too repelled by the incivilities on all sides to undertake to manufacture more, and they have properly fixed their attention on the people in the stands—the nation's moderates, left and right, who are only tangentially involved in the fist-swinging and name-calling—as holding the key to how the thing comes out. "The notable fact about civil tumult today," John Gardner said, "is not that a few fanatics start it but that larger numbers of peaceable people tolerate it and lend themselves to it." The most "worrisome thing in the [New York hardhats] episode," the Journal observed, "was not violence by the workers but the cheering and confetti-throwing by the crowds of presumably respectable citizens."

We expect that if Mrs. Smith or Mr. Gardner or the editorialists at the Journal were asked whether they could not go back through the past few years and identify moments and moods in which they themselves had taken a mental short-cut or two in these matters, they would reply that they could. We know that we can. For it is characteristic of situations such as that to which this country has now come, that people and groups of people don't march into them in phalanx formation, eyes ahead, all self-aware; rather they slip into them, a bit at a time, sideways. And surely anyone who is honest knows why. There are, first, predispositions and perspectives that simply allow each of us to take some acts of violence seriously and not quite focus on others, perhaps for unwitting reasons of political or emotional convenience. Witness the outcries about the hardhats on the part of people

who could view more (politically) congenial bashing with relative calm; and witness the outrage expressed over left-wing inspired bombings by people who didn't and don't give a damn that hundreds of Negro churches and homes have been bombed and/or burned in the South in recent years. There is, again, beyond the problem of perspective, the very real effect of the cross-tug. One talks with a student who is touching and makes sense, a shopkeeper whose view is no less affecting or persuasive, and it's all a bit like the war in Vietnam and people's reaction to it: only those who are not aware of their own limitations can find their way through all the complexities and uncertainties and mutually cancelling truths of our social turmoil without doubt or inconsistency. So one day you're enraged and the next day you're mild and the day after that there is something else on your mind. And meanwhile it all gets worse—imperceptibly at first and then perceptibly. Around that time, if a nation has any luck at all, people like those we have cited will blow the whistle.

What should be plain to all of us by now is that the tired old locutions and debater's points don't constitute a worthy response—the so's-your-old-man line of reasoning that condones, or at least accepts, unspeakable acts on one side on the grounds that the other side has been even more unspeakable. There is another, less crude and infinitely more insidious response that Mrs. Smith's allusion to the Joseph McCarthy years got us to thinking about, and it too seems a good candidate for extinction—namely, the sentiment (never quite put in those historically fraught terms) that exculpates student and other violence on the grounds that one agrees with their objectives but does not approve of some of their tactics. For just as it was the last time around, tactics and objectives are inextricably bound together in this affair. Anyone who believes it is of no consequence the buildings are burned or bombed or that people are harmed or brute force exerted in the name of stopping the violence in Vietnam, plainly does not know what is wrong with the war there. And anyone hoeing a different political row, who believes it is acceptable for policemen or Guardsmen to gun down unarmed students or Black Panthers or rioters, does not know what is wrong about the campus or black violence he purports to deplore and similarly disqualifies himself as credible critic.

What Sen. Smith and Mr. Gardner and the Journal (and, we should add, a number of other voices) have done is to give meaning and illustration to that mindstopper "polarization," which they have wisely identified with the ungenerous new emotions of both the moderate right and left—the vanishing middle. We would add one point to their arguments, and, roughly, it is that there is nothing to "polarize" about. For it is true, in practical political terms, that a distinction can be drawn between "left-wing anarchy" and "right-wing repression," that the latter will tend to prevail in any broad-scale conflict, and that neither can, by its nature, win anything much worth winning in the end. But in another and maybe more important sense, it is a distinction without a difference. Surely those so-called "anarchists" of the left—the shouters-down and seizers and bombers—are in fact repressors. And surely "repression" in the form of extra-legal police violence or hardhat rampaging is of a piece with anarchy so far as its effect on order, law, and authority is concerned—is anarchy, in fact. The first is no suitable refuge (even at second hand, from the stands) for people of the left who fancy themselves free spirits. The second is no suitable refuge for people of the right who believe themselves traditionalists, upholders of duly constituted order. The combatants will doubtless keep up the fighting. But isn't it time for everyone else to wonder what he is so loudly (or secretly) cheering for?

SOCIAL SECURITY'S POWER TO TAX

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17550, which started out as a bill to increase social security benefits passed the House on May 21 with amendments delegating to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the power to raise taxes. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, page 16557 of the Record on that date, set forward a succinct statement of the threat to constitutional government should this bill ever become law.

There have been additional developments which may well amplify the danger of turning the power to tax over to an unelected Cabinet official.

The Associated Press, on May 19, reported that the plan for a national health insurance system was the brainchild of Walter Reuther. On May 25, 1969, Robert J. Myers resigned his position as Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

H.R. 17550, which has now passed the House, raises the taxable base from \$7,800 to \$9,000 and boosts the tax rate from 4.8 to 5.2 percent. According to Mr. Myers:

The top policymaking officials for the Social Security Administration have strong beliefs in the desirability—even the necessity—of the public sector taking over virtually all economic security provisions for the entire population and thus eliminating private efforts in this area.

Mr. Myers feels the policymakers have as their goal a \$15,000 salary base for the tax and a scheme of eventually establishing retirement benefits equal to earned income before retirement—so long as it is the workers' tax dollars that support the bureaucracy.

Many Members are already aware that the efforts to tie social security benefits to the cost of living are but the groundwork toward financing an entire public insurance system out of general tax raises rather than from a trust fund.

If that day ever arrives, the country is finished.

Several newspaper clippings and a letter follow:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 4, 1970]

EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY

After 33 years in the Social Security System—23 years as chief actuary—Robert J. Myers is apt to know as much, and probably more, about the subject than anyone else.

But Mr. Myers has resigned his \$35,300 job because he disagrees with the apparent philosophy of the top managers of the Social Security System. He said Commissioner Robert M. Ball and his deputy, Arthur Hess (both appointed under Democratic administrations), are seeking to expand the system to cover "complete economic security for everyone."

The Social Security tax already has been raised 13 times, and another raise is in the works. The tax this year, it is estimated, will cost employers and employees more than \$38 billion. Some lower income people already

pay more in Social Security taxes than in income taxes.

If the "expansionists" in the Social Security System have their way, Mr. Myers says, the benefits in retirement eventually will be virtually as high as income before retirement.

The original aim of the Social Security System was to lay down a "floor of protection" which would provide retired people with a minimum income. Only about 7 per cent of those now drawing social security lack other sources of income.

Social security taxes now are levied on the first \$7,800 of everybody's wage. The House has passed a bill to raise this level to \$9,000 and to boost the rate from 4.8 per cent to 5.2 per cent. The "expansionists," Mr. Myers says, are shooting for \$15,000 salary base for the tax. (Employers match the tax on employees.)

The question is: At what point does the tax on individuals, and the cost to business, become overly burdensome in proportion to the need? And at what point, if the expansion continues, are private pension funds overshadowed and diminished?

Mr. Myers' resignation raises some fundamental questions. These questions should be scrupulously explored by both the Nixon Administration and by Congress. We think it a shame the government has lost the expertise of Mr. Myers—but if his resignation will lead to a thorough examination of all these questions, along with a wide public debate, some good may come of it.

Social Security is a compulsory system for most Americans. The people who pay the taxes to support it ought to have more opportunity to determine where it is going.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 2, 1970]

ACTUARY QUILTS IN ANGER—FLAYS "EXPANSIONISTS" AT SOCIAL SECURITY (By William Steif)

The Social Security Administration (SSA) is looking for a new chief actuary today because members of the Nixon Administration "outraged the moral sense" of Robert J. Myers, who was SSA's chief actuary for 23 years until he resigned last week.

Mr. Myers' anger, however, is not directed at the White House. It is aimed at his superiors in the Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Department and at his former colleagues within SSA.

The soft-spoken actuary, a federal employee since 1934, said in an interview today that he quit his \$35,300-a-year post for a principle.

Mr. Myers, 57, charged that Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball, Deputy Commissioner Arthur Hess, both appointed by Democratic administration, and other "expansionists" within SSA were trying to build a system of "complete economic security for everyone" when the loss of earnings occurs.

SEEK INCOME PARITY

The expansionists "feel the government's responsibility for retired persons goes far beyond providing a level of benefits on which the vast majority can subsist," he said. "They feel the government should provide a level of income virtually as high as income before retirement."

By contrast, Mr. Myers conceives of Social Security as only "a floor of protection." He said "this conservation administration should be speaking out to educate the American people. The expansionists are keeping quiet and when the Democrats come into office again, they'll be off to the races."

By that, Mr. Myers said, he meant that the expansionists would squeeze out private pension plans, vastly curtailing these plans' investments with dire consequences to the private enterprise system.

CREATING VACUUM

He said evidence of the effort to stifle private pension plans lay in the Internal Revenue

Service's recent revision of tax allowances "to restrict the growth and development" of the private plans, leaving "a vacuum that could only be filled by expansion of Social Security."

"I didn't feel I had a right to speak out" when the Democrats were in control, Mr. Myers said. But "the new administration should have its own political people in political jobs. It didn't—it has no one from the insurance, private pension or employee benefits industries. Social Security is run just the way it was when (former HEW secretary) Wilbur J. Cohen was here and trying to expand it in a number of ways."

Mr. Myers said he warned HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch and Under Secretary John G. Veneman of "the pitfalls" when the new Social Security law was being drafted last year. But HEW and especially Mr. Ball and Mr. Hess "tried to push" Social Security much further by proposing a wage base as high as \$15,000 and increasing the Social Security tax.

Fortunately, Mr. Myers said, "the congressional and White House officials saved the program . . . but even now, people here (SSA) don't support it strongly."

BACKS NIXON

Mr. Ball denied this, saying "I fully support the President's policies and recommendations in the Social Security field."

Mr. Myers said the House's decision to adopt Mr. Nixon's plan for adding a cost-of-living mechanism to Social Security elated him. He said this would keep the relationships among payments, wage base and tax consistent.

Benefits now are "reasonably adequate," he argued, "and taxation is high enough. Only 7 per cent of those on Social Security now require welfare."

Mr. Myers denied he wanted Mr. Ball's job, as has been rumored for months. "My first choice would be to stay in this job I dearly love," he said.

But Mr. Myers has been increasingly critical of his bosses, Mr. Ball noted, and said "it has become clear for some time that Mr. Myers is no longer content to serve as an objective career civil servant, but wants to be a policy spokesman. This was not his function . . . I believe it is primarily for this reason he resigned from his job."

Mr. Ball praised Mr. Myers' "technical competence, knowledge and important contributions" and said it was "too bad he chose to end his career at Social Security in this way."

A spokesman for the commissioner insisted there were no major philosophical differences between Mr. Ball and Mr. Myers, and that Mr. Ball, too, believed in the "pluralistic approach—a compulsory system supplemented by private pension plans and thrift, and backstopped by welfare."

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1970]

REUTHER LEFT APPEAL FOR U.S. HEALTH PLAN

NEW YORK, May 19.—Walter P. Reuther, killed in an airplane crash May 9, left behind an impassioned plea for a system of national health insurance in the United States.

He worked on it during the afternoon before he, his wife and four other persons plunged to their deaths. It was to have been delivered at the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation awards luncheon on May 14. Sen. Edward F. Kennedy (D-Mass.) substituted for Reuther.

In Reuther's prepared remarks, made public today, he made several points for a national health service which he said would cost no more than Americans are now spending privately.

They include a demand to end waste and make use of communal facilities, public accountability, a special development fund, and putting the program under the Social Security system.

"This," Reuther said, "is really the first

time in human history that man is capable of mastering his physical environment. But a basic dilemma remains in the human community: Science and technology have multiplied many times man's power—but they have not increased his understanding, or his compassion, or his sense of brotherhood, or his sense of human solidarity at the very moment in human history when these virtues may be the very essentials of man's capability to survive."

This dilemma, he said, was especially prevalent in the United States.

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 8, 1970]

A key member of Congress, commenting on House approval of tying Social Security benefits to the cost of living: "It is a step toward financing the system out of general tax receipts, rather than out of a trust fund. If we ever reach that day the country is finished."

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You may be interested in seeing this. On May 25, Under Secretary Veneman accepted my resignation, effective immediately, after Commissioner Ball attempted, in vain, to muffle and intimidate me with regard to three speeches that I was making in support of the Nixon Administration's position on Social Security legislation.

ROBERT J. MYERS.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1970.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is with the utmost regret that I am constrained to submit my resignation as Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

I am deeply concerned about the welfare of the Nation, and I wish to serve the Nixon Administration and the Congress to the best of my ability. I believe that I can best serve these causes by remaining in my present position until the President signs the Social Security bill which will result from the pending Congressional deliberations. Therefore, I have not set a definite date for my resignation. If you believe that my continued presence is not in the best interests of the Department, I will be glad to make my resignation effective at any earlier date. I would appreciate your informing me as to your views on this matter.

I wish to make it clear that my resignation is by no means related to my views on the pending Social Security legislation. In fact, the situation is quite the opposite. I strongly believe that the President's proposal is an excellent one, including its sound financing. It is certainly the most progressive, forward step taken in the Social Security field in many years.

I believe that the President's proposal very well conforms with, and implements, the moderate philosophy of Social Security. It is a progressive, forward step that would prevent future over-expansion of the program, which would destroy private efforts in the economic security field and thus lead to serious consequences insofar as our national economy is concerned.

I should also add that now—as at all previous times during my 35 years of actuarial service with the Social Security program—no one has made any attempt whatsoever to influence or sway the technical actuarial cost estimates for the existing program or any proposed changes therein.

The question might well be raised as to why I believe, in all conscience and integrity, that I must resign. I have previously talked with you about my strong personal beliefs

and have given you much supporting factual evidence to substantiate my views—namely, that certain of the top policy-making officials of the Social Security Administration (who are holdovers from the Johnson Administration) have strong beliefs in the desirability—even the necessity—of the public sector taking over virtually all economic security provisions for the entire population and thus eliminating private efforts in this area. It seems to me that this viewpoint is completely alien to that of the Nixon Administration.

Further, and equally important, it is my deeply-held conviction, as I have expressed to you a number of times in the past, that these officials of the Social Security Administration have not—and will not—faithfully and vigorously serve the Nixon Administration. Rather, they will exert their efforts to expand the Social Security program as much as possible by aiding and supporting any individuals and organizations that are of this expansionist conviction. Such anachronistic actions took place extensively during the Eisenhower Administration—against its political views. Such working at cross purposes with the Nixon Administration has occurred in the past year, and is still occurring, although to a somewhat limited extent so far. I have brought to your attention, on several occasions, the fact that the Social Security Administration is excessively wasteful by spending far too much time and money in performing research, conducting program planning, and collecting statistics in a manner that is not only nonproductive of sufficient worthwhile results, but also inimical to what I understand to be the philosophy and goals of the Nixon Administration.

Undoubtedly, there will be those who will say that I am taking this action solely or largely because I seek enhanced personal recognition. This is not the case. There is no position of any type that I would rather serve in than my present one, and I am not happy to have to leave it.

Evidently, no credence is placed in what I have related to you personally or in other evidence that I have furnished you on this matter, which has such an important effect on the future of the Social Security program. Therefore, I must, in good conscience and personal integrity, resign. It is especially dismaying to me to have to take this action, because I had hoped to serve the Nixon Administration not only with competence and integrity—as I had tried to serve all previous Administrations—but also with great enthusiasm, since I strongly believe in its philosophy and goals.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MYERS, S.S.A.,
Chief Actuary.

MARGUERITE RAWALT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Marguerite Rawalt, the distinguished Washington attorney, testified recently before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in behalf of the "Equal Rights Amendment." Marguerite Rawalt served as a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and of the first Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1961-68; as chairman of the Committee on Civil and Political Rights of Women, and of the Task Force on Family Law and Policy. She served as president of the Federal

Bar Association, the National Association of Women Lawyers; the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and as chairman of the Legal Committee of the National Organization for Women, 1966-69, when it took up first appeals in the title VII cases. At this time, I insert in the RECORD Marguerite Rawalt's testimony for everyone to read:

SUPPORT OF THE "EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT" TO THE CONSTITUTION (By Marguerite Rawalt)

This following analysis of laws and court decisions compels the conclusion that American women of 1970 are without "equal protection of law" and "due process of law" guaranteed to "all persons" by the 14th and the 5th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

The United States Supreme Court is the final interpreter of what the Constitution means. The Court does not rule in a vacuum, but upon a specific case situation measured against an existing law, or the Constitution. Crowning the pediment above the white marble columns of the Supreme Court building are the words "Equal Justice Under Law". But equal justice does not exist for women under the Constitution as interpreted to date. They are the one remaining "class" and category not yet adjudged to come under the legal umbrella of the Constitution, except for their right to vote. Constitutional guarantees may not be denied on account of race, religion, or national origin (even aliens). Yet, that one-half of each race, or origin, born female, is still outside the ambit of such legal protection. For example, shall the Negro woman be employed because race discrimination is illegal, or be denied such employment because she is female subject to restrictive laws?

The U.S. Congress should no longer tolerate this injustice in the society of a great world power. It should act without any further delay to submit to the States for ratification, the pending "Equal Rights Amendment" which would establish a clear and unambiguous constitutional yardstick for measuring laws which discriminate against half of the citizens. The proposed amendment reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

This amendment calls for legal equality for both men and women, and would strike down any law restricting the freedom of women or men on the basis of their sex.

The 14th Amendment, ratified in 1868, forbids any State to "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; or to deny any person the equal protection of the laws." The 5th Amendment, applicable to the Federal Government, forbids depriving "any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law."

As interpreted by our courts, the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution uphold a whole network of State discriminatory laws limiting women in the right to work, limiting the rights of married women in ownership and management of property, precluding them from choosing their domicile, and restricting other civil and political rights. For example:

1. The lack of constitutional protections for women of the U.S. has supported the failure of our Congress to ratify the United Nations Convention on Political Rights of Women, thus creating a cloud upon our international image as a democracy.

2. The 14th Amendment did not give women the right to vote.

3. The 14th Amendment has never yet been applied by the Supreme Court to guarantee to an individual female citizen, the right to work at any lawful occupation of her choice, although the Court has applied its "equal protection" clause to insure the right

to work to Chinese laundrymen, Japanese fishermen, a train conductor, and an Austrian cook. The Court as early as 1872 denied the application of the amendment to give a woman the right to practice law.

4. The Supreme Court, on the other hand, has applied the 14th Amendment to limit, restrain, and deny freedom to work to women by upholding maximum hours limitations, upholding exclusion from certain occupations. Its 1908 decision in *Muller v. Oregon* excluded women from "equal protection" by the rationale that "sex is a valid classification" for imposing restrictions which barred women from jobs. This precedent stands today, 62 years later, and has been the bulwark of the existing multitude of State laws enacted under the euphonious label of "protective labor laws".

5. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, forbidding discrimination in employment, after 5 years of operation, has not received consideration by the Supreme Court. One case which the Court accepted on March 2, 1970 does not involve the constitutional issue.

6. The 14th Amendment does not insure equitable property rights to married women.

7. The 14th Amendment has not fully opened doors to jury service by women.

8. Through the decades, the 14th Amendment failed to abrogate laws imposing longer prison terms on women criminals than for men. It was not until 1968 that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court struck down such a law in that State.

1. *Our country's international image.* The legal status of women of the United States is one of the greatest hypocrisies of our nation. The United States solemnly signed the United Nations Charter whose preamble asserts that "We the people of the United Nations, determined to reaffirm faith in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small . . ." and whose purposes declare "fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion". Yet the United States has refused to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Political Rights of Women, which merely affirms that "women shall be entitled to vote in all elections, be eligible to hold public office, on equal terms with men." The Assistant Secretary of State in 1947, explained that "If the Equal Rights Amendment were added to the Constitution there would be nothing of a constitutional nature to prevent signing."

The American Law Institute's "Statement of Essential Human Rights" declares that "Every one has the right to protection against arbitrary discrimination in the provisions of the law because of race, religion, sex . . ." and that "Barring an individual or group from the exercise of any right on the grounds of WHO they are (e.g. women, Negroes, Catholics) as distinguished from WHAT they have done (e.g. criminals or mental incompetents) would constitute arbitrary discrimination."

2. *The 14th Amendment did not give women the right to vote.* In 1873 Susan B. Anthony and other women were indicted and fined by the Federal Court of New York for having cast ballots in the 1872 presidential election. The Court ruled that "equal protection of law" did not apply to give them voting rights.

It required 50 years of pleading and persuasion before the U.S. Congress and before the State legislatures before the (19th) amendment was ratified to declare that the right to vote "shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or any State on account of sex." In 1963 a court decision states that a Negro's vote and a woman's vote are an equal vote, whatever their race or sex.

3. *The 14th Amendment did not give women the right to practice a lawful profession.* In 1872, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the denial to a woman of the right to

practice law in Illinois. The 14th Amendment was held inapplicable. The Court thus affirmed the decision of the Illinois Supreme Court which had said:

"That God designed the sexes to occupy different spheres of action . . . that it belonged to men to make, apply and execute the laws, was regarded at common law as an almost axiomatic truth."

Ultimately, all States extended the right to practice law to women.

4. *The 14th Amendment has not been held to extend to women the right to work at any lawful occupation of an individual's choice.* In a line of decisions from 1884 to 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court has made it clear that the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment guarantees the right to follow any of the common legitimate occupations of life—IF you are a male citizen or a male alien.

The Court struck down a San Francisco ordinance which denied licenses to operate laundries to Chinese.⁵ In 1914, it outlawed a Texas statute which operated to deny the job of freight train conductor to a fireman-engineer.⁶ In 1915, the Supreme Court voided an Arizona statute which restricted an alien Austrian cook from working in a restaurant. Said the Court:

"It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the country is the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment (14th) to secure."⁷

To this writing, research has failed to disclose a single case in which our high court has upheld the right of an individual female to work at any lawful occupation of her choice. To the contrary—

4(a). *The 14th Amendment has been applied to limit and restrict women in the right to work at any occupation of their choice.*

Sex discrimination exists under the labor laws of every State, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, with the signal exception of the State of Delaware which repealed all such laws in 1969 according to the Handbook of Women's Bureau, 1969.

Beginning with the Massachusetts statute of 1874 limiting hours of work for women, an expanding deluge of laws limiting not only hours of work, but overtime pay (reserved to the men), exclusion from certain occupations altogether, weight that might be lifted on certain jobs, varying from a low 12-pound maximum to a 35-pound one, exclusion from night work when pay was highest, etc. These laws were in truth enacted for the men, and by the men at a time when no women had a voice or a vote. And at a time when relatively few women worked outside the home. Today, the women's workforce is more than 30 million. Under the beneficent-sounding and deceptive banner of "protection" of the "weaker sex" these limitations continue to this day, solidified into union contracts which preclude most of the 3½ million union women right out of promotions, overtime pay, and even seniority rights. These laws reach nationwide to impose limitations upon non-union women numbering in millions. Because of "exceptions" they offer no "protection" against long hours to the semi-professional thousands in offices, nor to the scrub-women who work into the night cleaning offices and business establishments.

Today, 41 States and the District of Columbia have maximum hours limitations on women workers. This precludes employers from promoting them to supervisory jobs where overtime may be required and must be available, and precludes them from opportunities to earn the attractive double pay for overtime. Weight-lifting limitations (varying from 12 to 35 pound maximums) imposed by state law or by company policy

are a basis for keeping women out of jobs they are qualified to fill.

These restrictive laws for women, under the guise of "protection" came under early review by the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1905, that Court held that a New York law limiting the hours of labor for male and female workers in a bakery was a violation of the 14th Amendment and invalid.⁸ But, just three years later, the Supreme Court upheld the Oregon statute imposing maximum hours for women only which likewise was challenged under the 14th Amendment as a denial of equal protection of law. In a landmark decision titled *Muller v. Oregon*, the Court upheld the hours limitation for women workers by declaring the principle "*Sex is a valid basis for classification*". Women, as a class, could be denied equal protection under the 14th Amendment. This decision has supported and undergirded the whole structure of restrictive labor laws on women workers, and stood unchallenged until Congressional action of 1964.

This doctrine of placing all females in a "class" as a ground for denying 14th Amendment protection, has mushroomed through the years. As late as 1960, for example, the Texas Court of Appeals quoted this shibboleth as authority for refusing admission of a woman to a State university; and certiorari was denied, notwithstanding the high court's decision in 1938 applying the 14th Amendment to order the University of Missouri to admit a Negro male student to its law school.¹⁰

5. *Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964 has not opened wide the doors of employment opportunity for women.*

Hopes leaped high among women when Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which, after amendment, makes it unlawful to discriminate in employment on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.¹¹

The prohibition against discrimination on account of "sex" was added on the floor of the House, by amendment. The Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, a distinguished lawyer, argued heatedly against this amendment, on the ground "it would put in question the protective labor laws for women".¹² Congresswoman Martha Griffiths presented realistic examples of the situation supporting inclusion of women, else the "white woman would be last at the hiring gate".

Title VII created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to administer these provisions but without giving to the Commission any enforcement powers. Its role is conciliation. The Commission's rulings today require that virtually all jobs must be open to men and women, based upon qualifications only.

Federal Courts and Title VII—and State "protective" laws.

Women themselves, in industry, have courageously filed complaints with the EEOC and have followed up by bringing suits in Federal courts to remove discrimination against them. The first three cases decided all ruled against the women plaintiffs. Two upheld weight-lifting limitations by State law and company policy. The third refused to find a "substantial constitutional question" in the conflict between an 8-hour maximum hours law of the State and the 14th Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to take appeal from the three-judge constitutional ruling and remanded the case for appeal through the U.S. Court of Appeals. These decisions were in June and August, 1967, and May 1968. At this point, Title VII stood not only meaningless so far as discrimination against women was concerned—it stood with two adverse decisions against it. What Congress had seemingly given, the courts had taken away.

The National Organization for Women, a newly formed civil-rights-for-women organization, came immediately to the fore,

offering legal and financial assistance to the women in all three cases. Women attorneys of NOW's Legal Committee volunteered their professional time and talents, filed appeals, battled delaying tactics, and prepared and filed briefs in two U.S. Courts of Appeals, as well as the appeal to the Supreme Court.

As a result, two landmark decisions came out of two Appellate Courts, turning the losses into wins. The U.S. Court of Appeals, 5th Circuit, in March 1969 handed down the first authoritative and final decision, reversing the District Court of Georgia, in *Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co.*¹³ The Court rejected a 35-pound weight limitation as a valid exception to the statute where the applicant had seniority and qualifications for the job.

The second landmark decision was handed down in September 1967 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, Chicago. Its decision voided sex discrimination based on weight-lifting limits, separate seniority lists for men and women, and job classifications serving to exclude women from the better paying posts. *Bowe et al v. Colgate-Palmolive Co. et al.*¹⁴ Two cases which involve the 14th Amendment issue and whether State hours laws are constitutional, are pending decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, San Francisco. *Mengelkoch v. N. American Aviation Co.* and *Rosenfeld v. Southern Pacific R.R.*^{15 16}

The Supreme Court agreed on March 2, 1970 to accept for decision a case involving the question whether a large industrial employer may legally deny a job to a woman applicant on the ground that she is mother of pre-school-age children. *Phillips v. Martin-Marietta*.¹⁷ No constitutional conflict is involved.

Employment discrimination reality. Within the past month an authentic survey was published by the Bureau of National Affairs, a first survey of 150 executives, about 60% representing larger companies employing 1,000 or more, and 40% executives from smaller companies. The survey revealed that today: 59% (nearly 3/5ths) of employers still disqualify women on the basis of sex; 51% of employers still apply the state "protective" laws, notwithstanding EEOC rulings, and even recent rulings of State Attorneys General that Federal law supersedes; 49% apply weight-lifting limitations; and 44% apply State maximum hours laws for women.

Thus, the only avenue open to women in industry to be free from the shackles of hours limitations, occupational shut-outs, weight-lifting limitations and other restrictions on their employment, is to incur the cost and delay, and risk to their jobs, of bringing individual or class suits in Federal Courts, case by case, employer by employer, State law by State law, to seek the right to employment at any lawful occupation of their choice—even the right to be considered for promotion to better paying positions. A constitutional amendment banning sex inequality would provide the unassailable yardstick for elimination of State laws binding women only. It would overrule "sex as a valid classification" foundation of present State restrictive laws.^{17a}

6. *The 14th Amendment does not insure fair and equitable property rights to married women.*

In every State in the Union, one or another kind of legal disability or restriction limits the property rights of married women, as reported by the President's Commission on the Status of Women.¹⁸

Property rights are fixed by State statutes. The 1944 opinion of the Florida Supreme Court summarized the situation:

"a woman's responsibilities and faculties remain intact from age of maturity until she finds her mate; whereupon, incompetency seizes her and she needs protection in an extreme degree. Upon the advent of widowhood she is reinvested with all her capa-

bilities which had been dormant during her marriage, only to lose them again upon remarriage. Intermittently, she is protected and benefited accordingly as she is married or single."¹⁹

There are 42 common law States, and 8 community property States. Under common law principle, each spouse owns whatever property he or she earns. Where the husband was the sole wage-earner or businessman, all the property acquired during the marriage was therefore his property. State statutes have variously modified the common law principle, yet some limitation remains in every jurisdiction.

In the community property states, husband and wife each owns an outright one-half of real property acquired during marriage, even though the wife has no outside earnings. But in most jurisdictions, the husband and not the wife, has sole management rights, enabling him to create debts and dissipate the property without knowledge or consent of his wife. Texas revised such law in 1968.

An equitable division of property upon termination of marriage which follows formula "that there first be deducted from each spouse's property the debts of that spouse. Inherited or separate property would then be excluded. The remaining properties, the marital property, would then be divided equally 50-50 between husband and wife." Such a formula appears in a recent draft uniform law or Dissolution of Marriage proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law.

The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women stated its considered conclusions that—

"Marriage as a partnership in which each spouse makes a different but equally important contribution is increasingly recognized in this country."²⁰

"During marriage, each spouse should have a legally defined substantial right in the earnings of the other, in the real and personal property acquired through those earnings and in their management."²¹

It seems clear that the proposed constitutional amendment would crystallize the 50-50 marriage partnership principle and set up a controlling legal test for eliminating remaining inequities.

7. The 14th Amendment has not opened doors to jury service for women.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 provided that women were entitled to sit on all Federal juries. "Entitled" on the one hand, but subject to a whole variety of conditions and practices applicable only to women, which still serve to limit State jury service.

Until 1966, three States totally excluded women from serving on juries. Indicative of the fact that State statutes still control, the Supreme Court in January 1970 upheld Alabama and Georgia statutes on jury selection, although holding that the particular jury commissions had abused their discretion in the exclusion to large degree of Negroes from the jury rolls.²²

There are still not less than 20 States and the District of Columbia which provide differential treatment for men and women as jurors, such as the requirement that any women must affirmatively request to be listed.

A constitutional amendment is needed which cannot be twisted into a ruling that "sex is a reasonable classification."

8. The 14th Amendment, through the decades, was not applied to abrogate longer prison sentences for women criminals than for men.

It was not until 1968 that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania voided that State's Muncy Act in a case in which a woman convicted of robbery was sentenced to prison for a term of up to 10 years, instead of the 1-to-4-year term which would have been the maximum sentence for a man for the same offense.²³

Footnotes at end of article.

The legislative rationale when such laws were enacted was that "it required longer to rehabilitate a female criminal than a male."

Congressional treatment of the proposed equal rights amendment.

All that Congress is asked to do is to submit the proposed constitutional amendment to the States for their ratification. At least ten States have already taken official action memorializing the Congress to do so.²⁴

In all the years and through all the Congresses since 1923 when it was first introduced, the House of Representatives has but once taken a vote upon Resolutions to submit the Equal Rights Amendment. For years, the proposal has not been reported out of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Four hundred and thirty-five members of the House are precluded from opportunity to vote upon submitting the amendment, although 238 members have introduced the bill in the 91st Congress.

The U.S. Senate has voted on this proposal on four occasions: in 1946, 1950, 1953 and 1960 in which is here described as a game of "shadow-boxing". When the Resolution declaring that "equality of rights under the law . . . shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex" came to the floor in 1950, and in 1953 and 1960, it was first "amended" by the addition of the so-called *Hayden Rider* which read that this "shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law on persons of the female sex." As one Senator put it: "In one paragraph it would grant women equality and in the second wipe out that equality by granting special benefits."

The real and effective opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment has come from organized labor and those determined to maintain and perpetuate the "protective" laws for women. All the devices of delay, recommitment, bottling up in committee, nullifying amendment, and counter proposals have been brought to bear in the Congress. In 1956, during debate on legislation to create the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee stated "distinctions based on sex had never been considered within the purview of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment." (Cong. Rec. House July 19, 1956, p. 12349).

At the opening of Congress in January 1961, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee introduced H.J. Res. 92 as a counter proposal to the Equal Rights Amendment, if we are to judge by a prior measure in 1947 of the same variety. The proposal each time was to establish a Commission on the Legal Status of Women "to study and review the nature and extent of discriminations based on sex" and to "report to the President, who in turn would transmit the report to the Congress." The opening paragraph reciting the policy in both instances was:

"Declaration of Policy. That it is the declared policy of the United States that in law and its administration, no distinctions on the basis of sex shall be made except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure, biological, or social functions."

The President's Commission on the Status of Women (1961-1963).

The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women (1963-1968).

The Commission on the Status of Women, appointed in 1961, was composed of 26 members charged by Executive Order "to develop plans for advancing the full partnership of men and women in our national life" with responsibility "for developing recommendations for overcoming discriminations in government and private employment on the basis of sex."

The Commission, chaired by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, included five Cabinet Secretaries, two U.S. Senators, two Congresswomen, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission,

the presidents of four national women's organizations, two representatives of trade unions including the AFL-CIO, one from industry, an editor, a lawyer, a college president, a sociologist, and a social research director. These 11 men and 15 women submitted their report, *American Women*, to President Kennedy in October 1963.²⁵ The Commission's "Invitation to Action" set off a nationwide response. The President immediately created by Executive Order a Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and a Cabinet Committee (the Inter-Departmental Committee, or "I.D." Committee) to go forward with implementing the recommendations of the Commission.

The most controversial issue in the deliberations of the Commission centered around the so-called "protective" labor laws for women, and the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. The Commission took a compromise route.

"Since the Commission is convinced that the U.S. Constitution now embodies equality of rights for men and women we conclude that a constitutional amendment need not NOW be sought . . . but early and definitive court pronouncement, particularly by the U.S. Supreme Court is urgently needed."

Seven years later, definitive court pronouncement is still urgently needed.

President Nixon after taking office in January 1969, appointed a Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women of individuals of his choice, and also appointed a Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. The Task Force submitted its report Dec. 15, 1969.

This Council endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment on February 7, 1970, and recommended that the President request its immediate passage by the 91st Congress.

When will organized labor give equality of opportunity to the female workers in its ranks and whom it represents in employment contracts?

The powerful American Federation of Labor, over the years, has opposed the Equal Rights Amendment on the ground that it would abrogate such "protective" laws for women as still stand on the books.

When California's 8-hour per day and 40-per-week laws limiting women workers was enacted, the Los Angeles Times of March 9, 1911 reported that "the passage of this revolutionary measure was anticipated because there has been unmistakable evidence that the Legislature and the administration is dominated by labor union influences."

The AFL-CIO statement to the Commission on the Status of Women in 1963 was as follows:

"Enactment of the Equal Rights Amendment would jeopardize existing state legislation establishing minimum wages, maximum hours, and other special provisions for the protection of working women against substandard conditions of employment."

A great break-through occurred when one progressive and powerful union, *The International Union, United Automobile Workers*, changed its policy to conform to Title VII as interpreted by the EEOC. Its published policy in 1969 cited the EEOC ruling that Title VII supercedes "such state laws" with which it is imperative that we comply conscientiously and vigorously.

"Many employers have utilized the so-called 'state protective laws' to deny women as a class, opportunities to work overtime, for recall, to bid on certain jobs, work in certain departments and on certain shifts, notwithstanding the fact that an individual woman might have had the seniority, skill and ability which should have been recognized. Wherever such a practice still exists the Local Union should challenge it both in grievance machinery and with EEOC."

Further, the convention body of the UAW meeting in Atlantic City this April, 1970, voted to endorse the proposed constitutional amendment.

Activity and Progress of the 1960 decade. In the passing decade, in the late 1960's,

women in all walks of life, of all ages, all economic situations, including young women students, have become aware and knowledgeable about their second-class legal status. A whole series of new organizations for women, by women, and of women have sprung up with one common purpose of demanding full freedom of choice to live and work as individual members of society.

President Kennedy's 1960 appointment of a Commission on the Status of Women, and its report on discriminatory laws and practices, proved to be a real call to action which has stimulated new thinking and progress. Commissions on the Status of Women in every state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have researched their laws and recommended and sought changes. Congress enacted Title VII in 1964, opening up new doors of employment opportunity. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has issued guidelines calling for elimination of restrictive conditions in employment on account of sex as well as race. The United Automobile Workers and at least one other large and respected trade union have changed stand and recommended elimination of the "protective" laws for women. The U.A.W. has gone further, and has voted its endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment. Litigation in Federal Courts, and the EEOC guidelines, have led to state determinations to withhold enforcement of these restrictive laws.

President Nixon's Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women in February 1970 endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment and recommended his action in the present Congress.

What overriding justification can there be for adhering to the opposition of the American Federation of Labor to the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in the light of today's economic conditions, in light of the facts that:

1. The AFL speaks only for a fraction of the working women who are affected by the so-called "protective" laws—its ranks number less than 3½ million women, compared with some 26,000,000 other women working outside the home.

2. The AFL speaks only upon a fractional area of the laws which affect women's legal rights, whereas equality is sought not only as to labor standards laws but as to laws governing property rights, civil rights, and political rights.

3. The AFL speaks only for a fraction of all women within its ranks, as illustrated by Federal Court suits which its members have had to institute at their own expense and risk, in order to seek enforcement and observance of Title VII as to sex discrimination.

4. The AFL does not speak for all big trade unions or small, since the powerful United Automobile Workers, and affiliated unions, have recently taken the position that the labor standards laws for women are restrictive and a violation of Title VII, and that the Equal Rights Amendment to the constitution is needed.

What holds Congress back? Why should it continue to set up a roadblock against submission of the proposed Amendment to the States?

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Muller v Oregon (1908) 208 U.S. 412.
- ² Cong. Rec. July 19, 1956, p. 12349.
- ³ Gray v Sanders (1963) 372 U.S. 368.
- ⁴ Bradwell v. Illinois (1872) 83 U.S. 130; also in re Lockwood (1894) 154 U.S. 116.
- ⁵ Yick Wo v Hopkins (1886) 118 U.S. 356.
- ⁶ Smith v Texas (1914) 233 U.S. 630.
- ⁷ Truax v Raich (1915) 239 U.S. 33.
- ⁸ Takahashi v Fish & Game Commission (1948) 334 U.S. 410.
- ⁹ Lockner v New York (1905) 198 U.S. 95.
- ¹⁰ Allred v Heaton (1960) Tex. Civ. App. 336 S.W. 2d 251; cert den 364 U.S. 517; reh den 364 U.S. 944. Missouri ex rel Gaines v Canada (1938) 305 U.S. 337.

¹¹ Civil Rights Act 1964, effective July 1, 1965; 78 Stat. 241-352 Title VII 78 Stat 254-6, 42 U.S.O. 2000.

¹² Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 2, pp. 2578, 2580, 2732, also H. Rep. 914, Part 2, to H.R. 7152, 88th Cong.

¹³ Weeks v Sou. Tel & Tel. Co. (CA-5, 3-4-69) 408 F. 2d 228, rev & rem. S.D. Ga. 277 F. Supp 117.

¹⁴ Bowe et al v Colgate Palmolive Co. (CA-7, Sept. 26, 1969) 416 F. 2d 711 rev. S.D. Ind. 272 F. Supp 332.

¹⁵ Mengelkoch v Industrial Welfare Comm. of Calif. and N. American Aviation Co. (C.D. Calif. 5-10-68) 284 F. Supp 950; appeal refused. Oct. 28, 1968, U.S.S.C. 393 U.S. 83; remanded to Dist. Ct.

¹⁶ Leah Rosenfeld v Southern Pacific Co. (D.C. Calif. 11-22-68) 293 F. Supp 1219, on appeal in Ca-9.

¹⁷ Phillips v Martin-Marietta. (CA-5, Oct 13, 1969) 416 F. 2d 1257, pet heh denied.

¹⁸ Bur. Natl. Affairs, Bull. No. 1047, Part 2, March 5, 1970. ASPA-BNA Survey: Employment of Women.

¹⁹ American Women (1963) report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. Obtainable Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, \$1.25—p. 47.

²⁰ Taylor v Dorsey (1944 Fla Sup Ct) 19 S. 2d 876.

²¹ Task Force Report on Family Law and Policy—to Citizens' Advisory Council on Status of Women. From that Council, Room 4211, Dept. Labor Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20210.

²² American Women supra. p. 47.

²³ White v Crook (M.D. Ala. 1966) 251 F. Supp 401. Hoyt v Florida (1961) 368 U.S. 57. Carter v Jury Commission (1970) 396 U.S. 320. Turner v Fouché (1970) 396 U.S. 346.

²⁴ Commonwealth v Jane Daniel (Pa. Sup. Ct. 1968) 243 A. 2d 400.

²⁵ States of New York, North Dakota, Minnesota, Maryland, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Massachusetts, Louisiana, California.

²⁶ Annals, American Academy Political Science, Vol. 251.

MRS. GUSSIE SANFORD: MILITARY WIFE OF THE YEAR—1970

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the Congress and the American public on the selection of the military wife of the year. We are all aware of the many thousands of military wives who devote untold energies to the betterment of civil programs while at the same time maintaining their homes, raising their families, and keeping the letters flowing to their husbands. They contribute much to maintaining the excellent morale of our Armed Forces, and all Americans owe them a great debt.

The idea for the annual award grew out of a world-wide entertainment tour to military families conceived by Art Linkletter and Wilson Harrell, president of Harrel International, Inc., and sponsored by Mrs. Alfred J. Stokely, president of Stokely-Van Camp, Inc. The tour not only brought entertainment to the wives and dependents of active duty military personnel, but it discovered and then focused attention on the remarkable work the military wives in all five branches of the service were doing on

bettering community relations between the military and the civilian population. It was then decided to hold a competition and to find the most outstanding military wife in all the services.

All women's clubs, whose memberships are wives of active duty Armed Forces personnel throughout the world are invited to submit nominations. Through a selection process, the field is then narrowed to five—a representative of each of the five major military branches of the service. The final judging is done by a panel of distinguished women at a formal dinner in Washington, D.C.

On the evening of May 26, 1970, the panel of judges selected Mrs. Gussie Sanford as the "Military Wife of the Year, 1970," and I am highly pleased to provide the following background information about the selection. It outlined some of Mrs. Sanford's many contributions in the interest of humanity, democracy, and freedom.

This young lady is an outstanding military wife of the year and a great American. Our House Armed Services Committee, the Congress, the Armed Forces and the country have every reason to be very proud of her.

MILITARY WIFE OF THE YEAR ANNOUNCED

Mrs. Gussie Sanford, wife of Army Lt. Colonel Albert Sanford, of Frankfort, Germany, the mother of five children was judged the Military Wife of the Year on May 26, 1970, at a gala banquet in the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C. This was the 4th annual award produced by Harrell International and sponsored by Stokely-Van Camp in cooperation with the Department of Defense.*

Mrs. Sanford was presented with a replica of a statue that is on permanent display at the Pentagon and is dedicated to the Military Wife of the Year, by radio-television personality Art Linkletter. Each of the five finalists were also given an eighteen inch bronze statuette, called the "Milli." Mrs. Sanford began travel the next day to military bases throughout the U.S. meeting with wives involved in volunteer activities and with volunteer leaders in the civilian world.

Each of the five finalists was presented to the audience of over 300 distinguished members of Congress, Department of Defense and Washington socialites by an entertainer or representative of her husband's service. Mrs. Anselma Beckwith, Coast Guard Wife of the Year was presented by TV star Monte Markham. Mrs. Anne Greer, Marine Wife of the Year was presented by astronaut Lt. Colonel Walt Cunningham. Mrs. Bonnie-Jane Luft, Air Force Wife of the Year, was presented by well-known military writer Louis Stoeckstill. Mrs. Gussie Sanford, Army Wife of the Year, was presented by Under Secretary of the Army, Thaddeus R. Beal, Mrs. Laure Weymouth, Navy Wife of the Year, was presented by film star Jackie Cooper.

Judges in the Stokely-Van Camp contest were selected by Mrs. Walter Varney Magee, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and were: The Honorable Mary Brooks, Director of the Mint; Mrs. John Sherman Cooper, wife of the Senator from Kentucky; Mrs. Clifford M. Hardin, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture; Mrs. Elmer Rusted, wife of the National Director of the U.S. Savings Bonds Division of the U.S. Treasury; and Dr. Bennetta B. Washington, Director, Women's Centers Job Corps and wife of the Mayor of Washington, D.C.

* The award is given to the woman with the most outstanding volunteer record in both civilian and military communities.

MAJORITY OF THE HOUSE URGES ARMS FOR ISRAEL IN LETTER TO PRESIDENT

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to enclose the following letter to the President, which as of this date, has been signed by 219 Members of the House of Representatives:

JUNE 10, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is clear to us that the moment has arrived for the United States to take firm action to meet the present danger posed by the involvement of the Soviet Union military forces in the Middle East. In the face of this threat, we believe that it is urgent that our government provide Israel with additional supersonic jet planes to enable her to deter aggression against her.

It is public knowledge that the Soviet-Arab aircraft strength is now four times the strength of that of Israel and that the presence of Soviet fliers and technicians may adversely affect Israel's heretofore qualitative advantage.

The Congress is vitally concerned with the threat of Soviet presence in the Middle East, as evidenced by the number of signatories hereto, and by the letter sent to the Secretary of State which was signed by over seventy Senators, urging the immediate sale of these planes so vital to the preservation of the balance and peace in the Middle East.

Respectfully yours,

Abbitt, Watkins M. (Va.). Addabbo, Joseph P. (N.Y.). Albert, Carl (Okla.). Anderson, Glenn M. (Calif.). Anderson, John B. (Ill.). Anderson, William R. (Tenn.).

Annunzio, Frank (Ill.). Ashley, Thomas L. (Ohio); Baring, Walter S. (Nev.); Barrett, William A. (Pa.); Beall, J. Glenn, Jr. (Md.); Bell, Alphonzo (Calif.); Beville, Tom (Ala.); Biaggi, Mario (N.Y.); Biester, Edward G., Jr. (Pa.); Bingham, Jonathan B. (N.Y.); Blatnik, John A. (Minn.).

Boggs, Hale (La.); Bolling, Richard (Mo.); Brasco, Frank J. (N.Y.); Brinkley, Jack (Ga.); Brock, W. E. (Bill) (Tenn.); Broomfield, William S. (Mich.); Brown, Clarence J. (Ohio); Broyhill, Joel T. (Va.); Buchanan, John (Ala.); Burke, J. Herbert (Fla.); Burton, Phillip (Calif.); Bush, George (Tex.).

Button, Daniel E. (N.Y.); Byrne, James

A. (Pa.); Camp, John N. Happy (Okla.); Carey, Hugh L. (N.Y.); Casey, Bob (Tex.); Celler, Emanuel (N.Y.); Chappell, Bill, Jr. (Fla.); Clark, Frank M. (Pa.); Clausen, Don H. (Calif.); Clawson, Del (Calif.); Cleveland, James C. (N.H.).

Cohelan, Jeffery (Calif.); Conable, Barber B., Jr. (N.Y.); Conte, Silvio O. (Mass.); Conyers, John, Jr. (Mich.); Corbett, Robert J. (Pa.); Corman, James C. (Calif.); Coughlin, R. Lawrence (Pa.); Cramer, William C. (Fla.); Crane, Philip M. (Ill.); Daddario, Emilio Q. (Conn.); Daniel, W. C. (Dan) (Va.); Daniels, Dominick V. (N.J.).

Davis, John W. (Ga.); Delaney, James J. (N.Y.); Denney, Robert V. (Nebr.); Dent, John H. (Pa.); Derwinski, Edward J. (Ill.); Diggs, Charles C., Jr. (Mich.); Dingell, John D. (Mich.); Donohue, Harold D. (Mass.); Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan (S.C.); Downing, Thomas N. (Va.); Dulski, Thaddeus J. (N.Y.); Duncan, John J. (Tenn.).

Dwyer, Florence P. (N.J.); Eckhardt, Bob (Tex.); Edwards, Don (Calif.); Edwards, Jack (Ala.); Eilberg, Joshua (Pa.); Fallon, George H. (Md.); Farbstain, Leonard (N.Y.); Fascell, Dante B. (Fla.); Feighan, Michael A. (Ohio); Fish, Hamilton, Jr. (N.Y.); Fisher, O. C. (Tex.); Flood, Daniel J. (Pa.); Flowers, Walter (Ala.).

Ford, Gerald R. (Mich.); Fraser, Donald M. (Minn.); Friedel, Samuel N. (Md.); Fulton, James G. (Pa.); Fulton, Richard (Tenn.); Fuqua, Don (Fla.); Gallagher, Cornelius E. (N.J.); Garmatz, Edward A. (Md.); Gialmo, Robert N. (Conn.); Gibbons, Sam (Fla.); Gilbert, Jacob H. (N.Y.).

Goldwater, Barry M., Jr. (Calif.); Green, Edith (Oreg.); Green, William J. (Pa.); Grover, James R., Jr. (N.Y.); Gubser, Charles S. (Calif.); Gude, Gilbert (Md.); Hagan, G. Elliott (Ga.); Haley, James A. (Fla.); Halpern, Seymour (N.Y.); Hanley, James M. (N.Y.); Hansen, Orval (Idaho); Harrington, Michael (Mass.).

Harsha, William H. (Ohio); Hastings, James F. (N.Y.); Hawkins, Augustus F. (Calif.); Hays, Wayne L. (Ohio); Heckler, Margaret M. (Mass.); Helstoski, Henry (N.J.); Henderson, David N. (N.C.); Hicks, Floyd V. (Wash.); Hogan, Lawrence J. (Md.); Holifield, Chet (Calif.); Horton, Frank (N.Y.).

Hosmer, Craig (Calif.); Howard, James J. (N.J.); Hull, W. R., Jr. (Mo.); Karth, Joseph E. (Minn.); Kee, James (W. Va.); Keith, Hastings (Mass.); King, Carleton J. (N.Y.); Koch, Edward I. (N.Y.); Kuykendall, Dan (Tenn.); Kyros, Peter N. (Maine); Latta, Delbert L. (Ohio); Leggett, Robert L. (Calif.).

Lennon, Alton (N.C.); Long, Clarence D. (Md.); Long, Speedy O. (La.); Lowenstein, Allard K. (N.Y.); Lujan, Man-

uel, Jr. (N. Mex.); McCarthy, Richard D. (N.Y.); McClory, Robert (Ill.); McCloskey, Paul N., Jr. (Calif.); McCormack, John W. (Mass.); McCulloch, William M. (Ohio); McFall, John J. (Calif.).

McKneally, Martin B. (N.Y.); Macdonald, Torbert H. (Mass.); MacGregor, Clark (Minn.); Madden, Ray J. (Ind.); Mailiard, William S. (Calif.); May, Catherine (Wash.); Michel, Robert H. (Ill.); Mikva, Abner J. (Ill.); Miller, George P. (Calif.); Minish, Joseph G. (N.J.); Monagan, John S. (Conn.); Moorhead, William S. (Pa.).

Morgan, Thomas E. (Pa.); Morse, F. Bradford (Mass.); Morton, Rogers C. B. (Md.); Moss, John E. (Calif.); Murphy John M. (N.Y.); Murphy, William T. (Ill.); Nix, Robert N. C. (Pa.); O'Hara, James G. (Mich.); Ottinger, Richard L. (N.Y.); Patten, Edward J. (N.J.); Pelly, Thomas M. (Wash.).

Pepper, Claude (Fla.); Pettis, Jerry L. (Calif.); Philbin, Philip J. (Mass.); Pike, Otis G. (N.Y.); Pirnie, Alexander (N.Y.); Podell, Bertram L. (N.Y.); Preyer, Richardson (N.C.); Price, Melvin (Ill.); Pucinski, Roman C. (Ill.); Rallsback, Tom (Ill.); Randall, William J. (Mo.); Rees, Thomas M. (Calif.).

Reifel, Ben (S. Dak.); Reuss, Henry S. (Wis.); Rhodes, John J. (Ariz.); Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (Mich.); Rodino, Peter W., Jr. (N.J.); Rogers, Byron G. (Colo.); Rogers, Paul G. (Fla.); Rooney, Fred B. (Pa.); Rooney, John J. (N.Y.); Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (N.Y.); Roth, William V. (Del.); Roubidoux, Richard L. (Ind.).

Roybal, Edward R. (Calif.); Ryan, William F. (N.Y.); St Germain, Fernand J. (R.I.); Sandman, Charles W., Jr. (N.J.); Satterfield, David E., III (Va.); Scheuer, James H. (N.Y.); Schneebell, Herman T. (Pa.); Shriver, Garner E. (Kans.); Sikes, Robert L. F. (Fla.); Sisk, B. F. (Calif.); Stanton, J. William (Ohio); Steiger, William A. (Wis.).

Stokes, Louis (Ohio); Stratton, Samuel S. (N.Y.); Stubblefield, Frank A. (Ky.); Symington, James W. (Mo.); Taft, Robert Jr. (Ohio); Thompson, Fletcher (Ga.); Thomson, Vernon W. (Wis.); Tunney, John V. (Calif.); Udall, Morris K. (Ariz.); Van Deerlin, Lionel (Calif.); K. (Ariz.); Van Deerlin, Lionel (Calif.); Vanik, Charles A. (Ohio); Vigorito, Joseph P. (Pa.); Waggonner, Joe D., Jr. (La.).

Waldie, Jerome R. (Calif.); Watkins, G. Robert (Pa.); Whalley, J. Irving (Pa.); Williams, Lawrence G. (Pa.); Wilson, Bob (Calif.); Wilson, Charles H. (Calif.); Winn, Larry, Jr. (Kans.); Wolff, Lester L. (N.Y.); Wright, Jim (Tex.); Wyatt, Wendell (Oreg.); Wyder, John W. (N.Y.); Yates, Sidney R. (Ill.); Zion, Roger H. (Ind.).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 11, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.
Hebrews 11: 10.

O God of grace and goodness, we thank Thee for America with her high mountains, her deep valleys, her broad plains; for her homes, her churches, her schools, her Government; above all, for her people dedicated to faith, to freedom,

and to the fruits of democratic living. We thank Thee for the heritage which is ours—the good gifts of the past—and we pray that we may continue these good works in the present, taking steps which lead to the higher ground of a free and a just society.

Help us and our people to accept our responsibilities as citizens of this Republic we love—to vote intelligently, to pay our taxes readily, to obey the laws of our land fully, to give our influence

to right and good causes heartily, and to live as free men ought to live, going beyond the requirements of justice and mercy.

Thus may we begin to feel a bit at home in Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.